

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`



THE

# BRITISH AND FOREIGN

# EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.



LONDON:

JAMES NISBET & CO., BERNERS STREET.

EDINBURGH: OLIVER & BOYD.

MDCCCLXXIV.

*Edinburgh:*
*Printed by John Greig and Son.*

# CONTENTS OF VOL. XXIII.

## NO. LXXXVII.—JANUARY 1874.

*ORIGINAL ARTICLES:—*


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Erasmus. By the Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D. | 1 |
| II. | Calvinism in Modern Life. By the Rev. James Iverach, M.A. | 36 |
| III. | The Anglo-Catholic Movement. By the Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D. | 67 |
| IV. | The Hamah Inscriptions: Hittite Remains. By the Rev. William Wright, B.A., Damascus | 90 |
| V. | The New Reading of the History of Israel. By the Rev. William Salmond | 99 |
| VI. | The Theology of "Culture." By the Rev. T. F. Henderson | 130 |
| VII. | The Testimony of Ancient Monuments to the Historic Truth of Scripture. By the Rev. William Thomson | 151 |


*CURRENT LITERATURE:—*


| | |
|---|---|
| American Quarterlies | 174 |
| Dutch and German Periodicals | 176 |
| Notices of New Books | 183 |


## NO. LXXXVIII.—APRIL 1874.

*ORIGINAL ARTICLES:—*


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Influence of Wicliffe upon Huss and the Bohemian Reformation. By the Rev. Peter Lorimer, D.D. | 205 |
| II. | The Church and the Synagogue. No. I. By the Rev. John C. Moore, B.A., Galway | 230 |
| III. | History of the Vatican Council. By the Rev. Professor Witherow, Magee College | 250 |
| IV. | The Sermons of Richard Hooker. By the Rev. James Murdoch, Pitsligo | 284 |
| V. | Re-organisation of the Prussian Evangelical Church. By the Rev. J. B. Paton | 321 |


*REPRINTED ARTICLES:—*


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | The Ruling Elder a Presbyter. By the late Rev. Professor Thornwell, D.D., LL.D. | 341 |
| II. | Calvin and Calvinism. By the Rev. William Graham | 355 |


*CURRENT LITERATURE:—*


| | |
|---|---|
| American Quarterlies | 372 |
| German Periodicals | 375 |
| Notices of New Books | 378 |

## LXXXIX.—JULY 1874.

*ORIGINAL ARTICLES:*— Page

I. The Place of Theology in the Work and Growth of the Church. By the Rev. Professor W. R. Smith . . 413

II. The Synagogue and the Church. No. II. By the Rev. John C. Moore, B.A., Galway . . . . . 441

III. Dr Charles Hodge and the Princeton School. By the Rev. Professor James Macgregor, D.D. . . . . 456

IV. Recent Roman Catholic Literature in France. By the Rev. Clement de Faye . . . . . 470

V. The Revival in Scotland. By the Rev. Professor W. G. Blaikie, D.D. . . . . 477

VI. Etruscan Researches. By the Rev. Joseph Edkins, of Pekin 492

VII. The Reformed Church in the Netherlands. By J. G. Van Ryn, Esq. . . . . 504

*REPRINTED ARTICLE:*—

Galilee in the Time of Christ. By the Rev. Selah Merrill, Andover, Mass. . . . . 531

*CURRENT LITERATURE:*—

American Quarterlies . . . . . 570

German and Dutch Periodicals . . . . 573

Notices of New Books . . . . . 579

## XC.—OCTOBER 1874,

*ORIGINAL ARTICLES:*—

I. Capabilities of Presbyterianism. By the Rev. William Taylor, M.A., Stirling . . . . . 617

II. The Christian Doctrine of the Nature and Origin of Sin. By the Rev. John Macpherson . . . . . 635

III. The Synagogue and the Church. No. III. By the Rev. John C. Moore, B.A., Galway . . . . . 661

IV. Is Christianity Superseded? By the Rev. T. F. Henderson, Lathones . . . . . 682

V. William Carstares. By Alexander Falconer, Esq. . 714

*REPRINTED ARTICLES:*—

I. Galilee in the Time of Christ. By the Rev. Selah Merrill, Andover, Mass. . . . . 745

II. Life and its Origin. By Professor H. Alleyne Nicholson, of the University of Toronto . . . . . 772

*CURRENT LITERATURE:*—

American Quarterlies . . . . . 787

German and Dutch Periodicals . . . . 789

Notices of New Books . . . . . 794

BRITISH AND FOREIGN

# EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

JANUARY 1874.

## ART. I.—*Erasmus.*

1. *The Oxford Reformers John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More.* Being a History of their Fellow-work. By FREDERIC SEEBOHM. Second edition. London, 1869.
2. *Erasmus: his Life and Character, as shewn in his Correspondence and Works.* By ROBERT BLACKLEY DRUMMOND, B.A. 2 vols. London, 1873.

WHOEVER has looked upon the portrait of Erasmus—that portrait which he himself was so reluctant to sit for[1]—must have wished to acquaint himself with the soul that dwelt behind those brightly intelligent but melancholy and sceptical eyes. Whoever has considered that large eloquent mouth, whose proportions are preserved by the finely cut curve which denotes scholarly taste, and whose massiveness is relieved by the humorous, ironical smile which plays about the upturned corners of the lips, must have said to himself, There is a man who has known and thought much, but who has strength enough to be free and airy in his movements with all his burden of knowledge,—a man who has seen strange and sad experiences in this world, but who has spirit enough to be gay, nay, to be hopeful and tender throughout,—a man who must have been the best of company while living, and who

[1] "Vix extortum est amicorum precibus, ut se pingi pateretur."—*Vita Erasmi—prefixed to the Colloquies.*

must have dropped from these lips pregnant sayings which cannot die. It is one of the great faces of the world, to be ranked with that of Dante, or of Newman; though distinctly memorable from the first glance we get of it, it draws one back again to look at it, as if there were a meaning we had not taken up, or perhaps a capability which even all the difficulty of three score years and ten had not developed.[1] And it is not the face alone which attracts us. The most superficial facts of his life shew us that it must be one of the most significant ever lived. The man who laid the egg which Luther only hatched; the man who in that time of fierce strife, when all Europe was divided into two parties diametrically antagonistic, refused to join either party, though wooed by both as essential to their complete success,—this man deserves to have his biography written and read. And yet, like Alexander at the tomb of Achilles, he may still weep for a biographer; or possibly it may give his restless shade a more congenial satisfaction, to observe the baffled efforts of his would-be biographers, as one after another they attempt to weave into a consistent character, his quite transparent and yet never sharply defined aims and leanings, or to form a readable narrative out of the perplexingly superabundant material which lies to the hand of any one who undertakes the work.

In saying that Erasmus has not yet found an adequate biographer, we do not mean to speak slightingly of the many well-equipped writers who have thrown light upon his character and career, and least of all, of the two authors whose works are named at the head of this article. Indeed, of Mr Seebohm's volume, we feel disposed to speak in terms which would at once be set down as exaggeration. And it is of little moment how we speak of it, for already it has been accepted as a standard work on a period which deserves the most careful study. Of Mr Seebohm's leading aim or conclusion, viz., that the theology of Jerome and the Oxford Reformers, is preferable to that of Augustine and Luther, we may have more

[1] In the nearly magnificent but queer Valhalla at Ratisbon, in which the busts seem to have been made to order rapidly and in large numbers, at so much per hero, neither inartistic dulness nor payment by the piece has availed to chisel that face into insipidity. But it is doubtful whether it was judicious to place amid all the solemn dignitaries, a face whose curl of the lip seems to be pouring perennial satire on the whole affair.

to say in the sequel; but however much we may dissent from his conclusions, we heartily admire his accurate research, and the masterly finish with which he has arranged and presented his material. His work has obviously been a labour of love, and it is not too high praise to say, that he writes in a spirit worthy of two of the noblest Englishmen, Colet and More; whether he has imbibed this spirit from so long cultivating their society, or whether his own native love of what is true and pure and of good report has led him to live with these congenial spirits. We have not happened to see any other production of Mr Seebohm's pen, but this volume alone gives him a place among our most accomplished writers in the historico-biographical department. It is this style of controversy we welcome; a careful and truth-seeking investigation into what men really thought and said, together with an earnest but dispassionate statement of the author's own views, if he thinks fit to give us them.

In this quality of uttering his own opinion, without spitefully abusing that of his neighbour, Mr Drummond somewhat fails. There is a want of dignity about his attacks on evangelical religion, which is beneath the historian; and there is a manifest bias in his reading of some of Erasmus' opinions, which will, we fear, cause the public to think his work rather a plea for looseness of opinion than an impartial narrative. His book is to a great extent a polemic; and a polemic against polemics. He is haunted throughout by the "evangelicals," and too frequently, to the reader's surprise, turns aside from his proper course to make a rush at them. We do not, of course, object to his interspersing his narrative with reflections of his own. We welcome reflections which reveal the springs of character or the pregnancy of a situation; reflections such as that master of critical biography, John Morley, knows so well how to insert.[1] We welcome the sudden flashes which George Eliot shoots through a whole region of life, leaving it for ever more comprehensible or more entertaining to us. But when a writer interrupts his narrative with passages which suggest that he is writing with a strong theological bias and with a controversial aim, it is inevitable that he loses as a biographer more than he gains as a controversialist. Mr Drummond sometimes

[1] It must be owned, however, that Mr Morley sometimes very seriously offends in the same way as Mr Drummond.

writes well, with information and force, on controverted topics; there are passages in these volumes which must have shewn extremely well in the *Theological Review*, where they first appeared, but his biography of Erasmus would have been better received, would have been read with greater pleasure and trust, and would have lived longer, had he exercised some self-restraint, and withheld from his book applications of his subject to modern circumstances, and indignant pleadings for his own school of theology. He may suppose, and justly, that to mend his own times is a higher task than to write a good biography. But as the dramatist who understands his art does not give us an interlude of sermon between the acts to enforce the moral of his piece; as the novelist who writes to reform a grievance or to shame out of countenance a social abuse, misses his end, just in so far as his teaching is separate from his story; so the greatest possible amount of light would have been shed on our times, and the greatest possible conviction produced in our minds, by the simple exhibition of Erasmus' own character and views. Nevertheless, Mr Drummond's book is valuable. To those who have tried to use Jortin's chaotic mine, we may best describe Mr Drummond's volumes as an arranged Jortin. The earlier writer had probably greater learning, and certainly had a keener edge on his mind; but any one who wishes to form an opinion of Erasmus, will find ample material for doing so in Mr Drummond's book. He will find in it a careful collection of facts, an accurate and spirited translation of the most important of Erasmus' letters, a skilful analysis of his best known writings, and sufficient allusion to those which are less read. It is a work of great diligence, and will be really useful as a guide to the study of Erasmus' own writings. No one can read it without feeling that he is in the company of a modest, unostentatious, painstaking, competent writer, who has the rare virtue of taking his own measure, and understanding what he is most likely to do well. There are a few writers who, as they move, shed a blaze of light into every surrounding region. We do not mean to claim for Mr Drummond a place among these; but we should deem it only justice, were his book acknowledged as a successful attempt to shed light upon a single and very important line of fact. And it is, at all events, the most satisfactory life of Erasmus which our language can boast.

Of other lives of Erasmus, a very judicious estimate will be found in Milman's well known and delightful essay, into which there is condensed an amount of information which few men could have afforded so prodigally to lavish on a Review article. But probably the most living portrait of Erasmus, is that which has been drawn, since Milman's article was written, by the accomplished and perfervid historian of the era of England's rejuvenescence. In one point certainly Mr Froude excels the other writers who have chosen Erasmus for their theme. He has abundant sense of humour. His wit indeed is earnest and fierce, but he quite understands, if he somewhat underrates, the more genial and less blood-thirsty satire of the author of the "Praise of Folly." Besides, he has a native genius for apprehending the characters of the past, if not with perfect accuracy, yet with a vividness of imagination which enables him to present them quite definitely before our eyes. And therefore it is Froude's Erasmus which lives in one's mind; and, correct the picture as we may, it is still the stronger colouring of that consummate artist that shines through our feeble re-touchings.

We fear that, like Erasmus himself, his true biographer has passed to that land in which earthly careers are read, not in the printed page of laborious investigation and doubtful criticism, but in results manifest to all at a glance, in fixed features of character which reflect an infallible judgment on the essence of what was done and thought here upon earth. A very few years ago the most ardent students of Erasmus felt that in the hands of James Hamilton his life and labours were safe, and looked eagerly for the completion of a work whose first portions gave promise of a complete and perfect biography. Here was the needed culture, diligence, humour, sympathy with the subject. Here was the eye, candid and truthful, open to see what was without, and not the mere reflection of what was within; here was the spirited, graphic style, which could engage the reader's interest and rise level with his theme. To many, as probably to Hamilton himself, it seemed that this was a subject instinctively chosen, as likely to elicit from him the fullest power he could exert; but by choosing a task which it will take years to finish, a man does not always secure that he shall live out these needed years.

We are not now to attempt to tell again the story of Erasmus' life, nor to re-mould material which has already passed

through the hands of accomplished writers. As we have already said, there are few lives regarding which there is more abundant or more accessible information. The romantic but sad story of his parents and of his birth has been told by Charles Reade, in his somewhat highly-coloured but entertaining and useful novel, "The Cloister and the Hearth." In Erasmus' own letter to Grunnius,—a letter vitalized by indignation,—we have a moving sketch of his youthful difficulties and troubles, of the unscrupulous arts used to entrap him into the monastic life, and of his unfitness for such a life by reason of his delicate constitution, which disabled him from enduring the smell of fish without a headache, and from getting to sleep again after rising for service during the night.[1] In the *Colloquies*,[2] he makes use of his own college experiences to expose some of the grievances under which students at that time laboured, and which, as he tells us, drove some to madness, and doomed others to leprosy or blindness for life. We see him in the College Montaigu (*Vinegar College*, from the sour or acid theological disputation that was carried on in it till the very walls reeked with theology; so he says) rising from a filthy bed, coughing out of his throat the damp which had distilled from the mouldy walls, and shivering out in the darkness and frost to break the ice from the well and draw the fetid water, scarcely distinguishable from the pestilential sewers that flowed or stagnated close by. By means of his letters it is easy to trace him indomitably fighting his way out of ignorance, poverty, obscurity, now keeping pupils in Paris, now teaching Greek at Cambridge, writing dedications, begging with more or less shamefacedness, declining the invitations of popes and princes but accepting their gifts, publishing books at almost every printing office in Europe, everywhere making some friends and many enemies, always learning and always making startling use of his learning, until he stood the recognised first scholar of the world. By means of his letters—a collection full of interesting reading, bringing one into pleasant connection with all the leading men of the age, and putting the reader into, as nearly as possible, a contemporary's point of view—we

[1] "Habebat adolescens peculiare incommodum, quod illi a teneris annis in hanc usque aetatem haeret. Non nisi profunda vespera potest obdormiscere, et a semel interrupto somno non redormiscit, nisi post horas aliquot." Ad Grun.

[2] Icthyophagia.

insensibly gather an impression of Erasmus and of his influence, as with him we impatiently revisit what he refused to call his fatherland, and preferred contemptuously to nickname his "beer and butter land"; or go with him to Rome, and mark the disappointment and contempt of the ecclesiastics that mingled with his admiration of the literary collections, and broke through his desire to stand well with all dignitaries; or dwell pleasantly with him in his most congenial residence at Basle, doing as much work in one day as most men did in two,[1] and yet finding time to stroll about in Froben's garden, or spend the afternoon writing in his summer-house; or come back again and again to England, drawn mainly by his love of Colet, "the best beloved of his age,"[2] attracted, too, by the culture of More, Linacre, Grocyn, Fisher, Warham, and others whom he is never weary of extolling, and bearing, no doubt, also a not unpleasing remembrance of the women who, probably for the first time, shewed him the possibility of combining a perfect purity of thought with the most encouraging frankness of manner, always leaving our island with regret, and prepared to defend everything in it but its houses;[3] thus we wander with him, sharing the hardships and the triumphs and pleasures of a literary life in the beginning of the sixteenth century, until the clouds gather, though not with so heavy a gloom as Froude depicts, and the air, which had rung with the voices and been brightened by the kind faces of many friends, becomes silent and chill, and the last touching signature is written, "Eras. Rot. ægrâ manu."

And the impression which is thus conveyed to the mind, is that of a man not of the very first order, either intellectually or morally. It has been observed by one who sows truth and error in about equal quantities, that "our fatuous persistency in reducing man to the spiritual, blinds the biographer to the

[1] "Plus operis abs te uno factum die, quam quantum abs quovis alio biduana opera exigi consuevisset."—*Scaliger's remark about Erasmus's work at Venice for the Aldine press*, quoted in Drummond, i. 172.

[2] Seebohm (p. 505) tells us, that his coffin bore an inscription which contains these words, "ob vitæ integritatem et divinum concionandi munus, omnium sui temporis fuit charissimus."

[3] See the letter in which he complains, like any sanitary commissioner, of the inconvenient internal arrangements and unwholesome situation of English houses. "The floors are commonly of clay, strewed with rushes, which are only lifted at long intervals, and under which lies unmolested, an ancient collection of beer, grease, bones, spittle, and every nameless abomination."

circumstance, that the history of a life is the history of a body no less than that of a soul; many a piece of conduct that divides the world into two factions of moral assailants and moral vindicators, provoking a thousand ingenuities of ethical or psychological analysis, ought really to have been nothing more than an item in a page of a pathologist's case-book." Certainly in any endeavour to estimate the character of Erasmus, we must take into account his nervous temperament. It was this which made him so keenly sensitive to physical pain, so averse either to its infliction or endurance. It was this which made him at once intensely alive to the current of public affairs, and shy of the responsibility and danger which beset a leader of opinion. It was this which fitted him for society and enabled him to find his best and most pleasurable stimulus in the friendship of good men, but this also which prevented him from shewing any of the deeper qualities which friendship elicits. Kindly, charitable, ever genial, he was a bright, cheerful, entertaining companion, but always, as one of his enemies said, "homo pro se." Often displaying a quick resentment, and sometimes as abusive in his language as Calvin, he was never vindictive. He was almost too ready to be reconciled to those who had injured him; in this, as in all matters, shrinking from disagreeable personal collisions, and from everything which would perturb him. He would involve himself with no party; he would identify himself with no movement which he could not himself control, with no opinions which might demand from him unwelcome action.

It is a mistake, however, to suppose that this was due to timidity; and it is a greater mistake to appeal to Erasmus' fear of death as a proof of this timidity. No one accuses Samuel Johnson of timidity, because we find him exclaiming, "O! my friend, the approach of death is very dreadful. I am afraid to think on that which I know I cannot avoid." And they who are fond of quoting passages, which shew that Erasmus partook of this common shrinking from dissolution, should have had the decency to remark also, that when death did approach, this fear and horror entirely disappeared. When he lay ill at Louvain, when doctor after doctor had turned from his bed in despair, and when the monks of Cologne were already shouting (in Latin worthy of the taste and feeling which prompted the triumph), that he had died "sine lux,

sine crux, sine Deus," his mind was calm and hopeful.[1] "When the disease was at its height, I neither felt distressed with desire of life, nor did I tremble at the fear of death. All my hope was in Christ alone, and I prayed for nothing to Him except that He would do what He thought best for me. Formerly, when a youth, I remember I used to tremble at the very name of death." So he writes in a letter to one of his most intimate friends.

Indeed, no one can read even a little of Erasmus' writings, without being amazed at his boldness. Read, *e.g.*, the description he gives in his "Adages"[2] of the royal bird:

"Let any physiognomist worth anything at all, consider the look and features of an eagle—those rapacious and wicked eyes, that threatening curve of the beak, those cruel jaws, that stern front—will he not at once recognise the image of a king? a magnificent and majestic king? Add to this a dark ill-omened colour, an unpleasing, dreadful, appalling voice, and that threatening scream at which every kind of animal trembles. Every one will acknowledge this type who has learnt how terrible are the threats of princes, even uttered in jest. At this scream of the eagle the people tremble, the senate yields, the nobility cringes, the judges concur, the divines are dumb, the lawyers assent, the laws and constitutions give way, neither right nor religion, neither justice nor humanity avail. And thus, while there are so many birds of sweet and melodious song, the unpleasant and unmusical scream of the eagle alone has more power than all the rest. Of all birds the eagle alone has seemed to wise men the type of royalty—not beautiful, not musical, not fit for food; but carnivorous, greedy, hateful to all, the curse of all, and, with its great powers of doing harm, surpassing them in its desire of doing it."

Pretty well this, for the beginning of the sixteenth century, and for one who received pensions or gifts from nearly all the kings and princes in Europe.

If further proof of the boldness of Erasmus be needed, it is to be found in his unsparing denunciation of the corrupt practices of the Roman Court, and especially of what Ranke terms "the ruling passion" of Pope Julius II.,—namely, his innate love of war and conquest. In the "Praise of Folly," Erasmus drew a picture of Julius which no one could mistake; "The decrepid old man, assuming all the vigour of youth, sparing no cost, shrinking from no toil, stopped by nothing, if only he can turn law, religion, peace, and all human affairs upside

[1] Romanists have for one reason or other altered their views of Erasmus, for we find one of their living writers making the audacious assertion, that he died "with the names of Jesus and Mary on his lips."

[2] Under the proverb "Scarabæus Aquilam quærit."—See Seebohm, 310.

down." The whole passage is important, as bringing out very unmistakably the point and vehemence with which Erasmus assailed the real evils of the Church of his own day:

"Of spiritual weapons, indeed," he says, "the popes are mighty liberal, of interdicts, suspensions, denunciations, greater and lesser excommunications, and bulls that fright those they are thundered against; and these most holy fathers never issue them more frequently than against those who feloniously and maliciously attempt to lessen St Peter's patrimony. For although in the gospel that apostle is said to have declared 'we have left all and followed Thee,' yet these popes speak of 'St Peter's patrimony,' as consisting of lands, towns, tributes, customs, lordships; for which, when their zeal for Christ is stirred, they fight with fire and sword at the expense of much Christian blood, thinking that in so doing they are apostolical defenders of Christ's spouse, the Church, from her enemies. As though indeed there were any enemies of the Church more pernicious than impious popes, who give dispensations for the *not preaching* of Christ; evacuate the main design of our redemption by their pecuniary sales; adulterate the gospel by their forced interpretations and undermining traditions; and lastly, by their lusts and wickedness, grieve the Holy Spirit, and make the Saviour's wounds bleed afresh. Further, as the Christian Church was founded in blood, and confirmed by blood, and advanced by blood, now in like manner, as though Christ were *dead*, and could no longer defend His own, they take to the sword. And though war be a thing so savage, that it becomes wild beasts rather than men, so frantic that the poets feigned it to be the work of the Furies, so pestilent that it blights at once all morality, so unjust that it can be best waged by the worst of ruffians, so impious that it has nothing in common with Christ, yet to the neglect of everything else they devote themselves to war alone."

Surely he who wrote this was not ambitious of a cardinal's hat, nor very careful about giving offence to the most formidable power then on earth. But we shall be better able to estimate his strength of character and his relation to the Church of Rome, after we have briefly reviewed his literary labours, and recognised what it was that he himself reckoned the proper work of his life.

His diligence in his proper vocation as a literary man has rarely been equalled, never surpassed, not even by the most "adamantine" of scholars, such as Heyne. For a combination of rapidity and brilliance of execution, his work may be compared to that of his almost compatriot, Rubens. The one artist "careers over the canvas," earning his hundred florins a day, and leaving from a few strokes of his brush a lasting joy to men. The other writes his forty letters a day, collates

manuscripts which are maddeningly corrupt, edits the most voluminous writers of antiquity, does not always earn as many florins as he could wish, but wins the hearty admiration and gratitude of all lovers of genial humour, pungent wit, and lively learning. Unconquerable as Richard Baxter, he worked on through the attacks of one of the most painful of diseases, and managed to produce sallies of merriment where other men would have fancied themselves legitimately excused from all but groans. Indefatigable as the elder Pliny, and infinitely less pedantic, he used every available moment for study, and was yet always ready to turn an epigram for a friend, and never denied himself the pleasures of social intercourse. He once challenged Froben to print as fast as he could write. He could compose in the midst of the greatest noise, and his great satire, "The Praise of Folly," is evidence that the work he produced on horseback, was of better quality than some which we are told proceeded from that stimulating seat.

Too frequently great scholars have wasted their energies on subjects of no general utility or even interest. But one is struck in reading over the long catalogue of Erasmus' literary labours, with the sagacity which, at the very revival of letters, guided him to discern what stood highest in literature. He stands between the ancient and modern world, as a kind of gentleman-usher, selecting with unerring instinct such writers as were worthy of immortality, redeeming them from the obscurity to which a non-reading world had consigned them, and introducing them, as free from soil as he could make them, to the world which dates from the invention of printing. A number of the classics which have ever since remained the favourites, he either edited or translated, or both. In summing up the character of Erasmus, Mr Drummond makes the somewhat unintelligible statement, that "original genius, or creative power of any kind, cannot be ascribed to him, nor was the time ripe for the appearance of any such qualities, when the apparatus of literary workmanship had still to be got into order" (ii. 346). Creative genius has not been wont to wait for the elaboration of any particular apparatus. But certainly, when we consider the difficulties which a scholar in those days had to overcome, the want of previous editions, the corrupt state of the manuscripts, the absence of grammars and dictionaries, and of trustworthy geographical and historical

information, it is impossible to overrate the perseverance, if not the genius, which compensated for the lack of these aids. The picture of a scholar's life which is graphically sketched in the letters of Erasmus, is very different from that which floats in the imagination of the youthful student of modern times, and invites him to a life of quiet if not of ease, to a comfortable competence if not to wealth. Tischendorf and Curzon are the modern scholars, whose adventurous labours in some respects most fitly compare with those of Erasmus. His frequent changes of residence were due not solely to the restlessness of his disposition, but mainly to his desire to consult manuscripts which lay scattered in distant libraries, and to find printers capable of executing his work. He was thus compelled again and again to traverse Europe, in days when travelling was both tedious and dangerous. At one time we find him laid up at Ghent with a sprain in his back, caused by the shying of his hack; again a dolorous lament comes from the banks of the Rhine in flood, and where he says he was kept swimming rather than riding. In one respect his fate was the same as that of more recent travellers, his passages from England to the continent prostrated him with sea-sickness. The channel had, besides, associations in his mind which might well have debarred him from ever revisiting our island. On one occasion he was stripped, by the custom-house officers of the niggardly Henry VII., of the hard-earned English gold with which he was expecting to pay his way through the succeeding year. On another occasion, after embarking, he discovered that his luggage containing his Jerome and the collation of New Testament MSS., was not on board —one of those skilfully contrived accidents which are still, we fear, sometimes practised upon travellers, for the sake of extorting the *trinkgeld* which is readily given in the moment of relief that follows the long anxiety. But his bitterest complaints are of the bad wines and stifling filthy inns of some parts of Germany. Every reader of the "Colloquies" remembers the passage in which he describes the sufferings of a guest in one of these inns; a passage we would quote, were it not so painfully graphic, that we fear our readers would sicken with the loathsome steam which rises from the damp and dirty travellers gathered round the stove, or finally turn from a page which thrust sights so disgusting before their eyes.

It was no ordinary zeal which carried the delicate and sensitive scholar through scenes such as these, but there was no sacrifice he was not prepared to make in the cause. "If any new Greek book comes to hand," we find him writing, "I would rather pawn my coat than not obtain it; especially if it be religious, such as a psalter or a gospel"—*especially if it be religious*, for those quite misunderstand Erasmus, who do not know, or refuse to believe, that his main object and chief endeavour, was to Christianise rather than even to educate Europe. "If we are genuine Christians," he says, "nothing ought to seem erudite, elegant, or admirable to us which is not redolent of Christ, wherever the subject admits of this." And again, "The highest object of the revival of philosophical studies, will be to become acquainted with simple and pure Christianity in the Bible." His preference for religious writings was sufficiently proved by his enormous labours in patristic literature. He edited the whole works of his favourite Jerome, of Cyprian, Augustine, Hilary, Irenæus, Ambrose, with portions of the works of Chrysostom, Athanasius, Basil, Epiphanius, and Lactantius. To read these works would in these degenerate days constitute any one a learned man, and it is oppressive to think of the labour involved in preparing so many ponderous folios for the printer, even though he had correctors of the press so accurate as his friends Lystrius and Beatus Rhenanus. Once or twice he broke down under the labour, but this was the sacrifice he thought himself justified in making to the Fathers, the true and legitimate worship of the saints. "We kiss the old shoes and dirty handkerchiefs of the saints," he says in his preface to Jerome, "and we neglect their books, which are the more holy and valuable relics. We lock up their shirts and clothes in jewelled cabinets; but as to their writings on which they spent so much pains, and which are still extant for our benefit, we abandon them to mouldiness and vermin."

It was this masculine sense and discernment which lifted Erasmus above the inveterate superstitions and follies of the time, and which also saved him from the vices peculiar to scholars. A mind that steeps itself in classical literature, sometimes gains refinement at the expense of robustness. In our own day, certainly, some of our most distinguished scholars have also been among the most vigorous thinkers, and have

been no less remarkable for practical sagacity than for delicacy of taste; but this is probably due rather to the tendency of the times than to the inherent influence of classical studies. It may have been due to the character of the times, that Erasmus did not degenerate into a mere bookworm, or student, or literateur; though the times did not save his friends Budæus and Reuchlin from that fate. But the nature of Erasmus retained throughout a manly vigour, which forced him to take a part in the stirring events of his times, and taught him to use his learning merely as a weapon in the fierce conflict which he himself had in great part stirred. His "Adages," of which one large edition after another was rapidly sold out, as no books of the size are now sold out, was not more remarkable for the unrivalled research it displayed, than for the fearless and pointed invective and satire which it levelled against existing abuses and stupidities. So it was with all his writings; they were all of the nature of artillery, not of fireworks; while the reader is admiring the flash, he finds himself already hit. Each of his writings has its motive in the real world around him, and all of them are alive with the characters he was daily seeing.

We must therefore ascribe it in great measure to Erasmus, that the Renaissance was even as Christian as it was. For, as Hallam tells us, "the object of the Italian scholars was, to write pure Latin, to glean little morsels of Roman literature, to talk a heathenish philosophy in private, *and leave the world to its own abuses.*" This school would use no word which was not found in the writings of Cicero, and would resort to the most circuitous circumlocution, or paganise the most sacred subjects and names, rather than depart from this rule. This trifling seemed to Erasmus both silly from a literary point of view, and dangerous to Christianity. And it was against this coterie of exclusive and semi-pagan purists, that he issued his effective "Ciceronianus." In this brochure, he holds up to ridicule the weak pedants who tabulated every word, phrase, and cadence to be found in the works of the master, and who, after reading no books but those of Cicero for seven years, can only feebly and stiffly imitate the graceful language of their

[1] Bembo is said to have kept forty portfolios, through all of which each sheet of his writings had to pass, being examined and corrected at every stage. See Hallam.

model. Erasmus convincingly proves that this is not the path to eminence in literature, and shews that it is a thorough understanding of the subject treated, and an interest in it, which give a forceful and copious style as they give a naturalness and warmth of sentiment, which captivate the reader. There is much in the "Ciceronianus" which is capable of universal application. He distinguishes between the slavish imitation which reproduces what is obsolete, and the intelligent revival of the ancient severity of taste. He proclaims the folly of putting new wine into old bottles; and discriminates between the adoption of antiquated forms, and the application to modern uses of the ancient enlightenment and knowledge. In a word, he distinguishes—and when will men learn the distinction?—between that imitation which consists in a superstitious clinging to old forms and traditional customs, regardless of their inapplicability to modern society, and that imitation which adopts the ancient spirit, and lets it freely produce such forms as may suit the changing times.

But while Erasmus exposes the literary mistake with overwhelming force and abundant humour, one sees that he has a much more serious aim than the exposure of a mere piece of silly pedantry. Erasmus thoroughly understood these Italian scholars, and knew that they preferred the culture of heathenism to the self-repressing ethics of the cross. If Christianity was not recognised as a force of sufficient power to produce a new vocabulary, it was because it was misunderstood or purposely held in the background. And if the ideal which these men of culture proposed was to be sought, Christianity must be held in the background, or appear only as the disfigured and dishonoured servant of culture. Erasmus saw that there might be a revival of paganism more dangerous than that attempted by Julian, and no one did so much as he to avert this danger. Not only in the "Ciceronianus," but in many other writings, and especially in his letters, he expresses the fear that the revival of classical literature might veil a revival of pagan sentiment, and professes that for his own part, he would rather be a Christian with the barbarians, than a pagan with the Ciceronians. This, coming from a man who knew Horace and Terence by heart, who had acknowledged that in reading Cicero, he could not but sometimes kiss the page, and pay tribute to the heavenly inspiration that had filled the

writer; this coming from the man who was acknowledged by all but Scaliger as the foremost scholar in Europe, could not be without a very powerful effect. Let those who are accustomed to think of Erasmus as himself but a half-hearted Christian, consider whether there was any other man then living, whose decision as to the relative positions of culture and Christianity, would have had the same weight in Europe, and whether he does not deserve our gratitude for so boldly and decidedly throwing himself into what might otherwise have been the losing side. For to ascribe his alienation from the Italian scholars to mere personal vindictiveness, is absurd. It is true he had been nicknamed *Errasmus*, by those who thought it a feather in their cap, to find him out in small *errors*, as he had been called *Porrophagas*, on account of his extreme fondness for the word *porro*. It is true also that he was unduly sensitive to such kinds of annoyance, but his other writings, and especially his letters to his dear friend Colet, put it beyond a doubt, that he did not prize culture for its own sake, but mainly as the best means of introducing a purer Christianity.

This is very clearly brought out by his connection with Dean Colet, in the founding of St Paul's school in 1510, which taken all in all, forms one of the most pleasing passages in the history of education. We see the two great men, the one the foremost scholar, the other probably the purest minded and bravest man then alive, filled with mutual esteem and affection, corresponding and taking counsel together, and finally devoting their means and their labour to the education of 153 boys. No sooner did Dean Colet receive his patrimony, than he devoted it to this object, ordaining that "the children should be taught good literature, both Latin and Greek, specially Christian authors who wrote their wisdom in clean and chaste Latin, whether in prose or verse; *for my intent is by this school*, specially to increase knowledge, and worshipping of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and good Christian life and manners in the children." One can scarcely mistake the spirit of the man who concludes the preface to the Latin grammar he wrote for his school in these terms:

"I pray God all may be to His honour, and to the erudition and profit of children, my countrymen Londoners specially, whom, digesting this little work, I had always before mine eyes, considering more what was

for *them* than to shew any great cunning. . . . Wherefore I pray you, all little babes, all little children, learn gladly this little treatise, and commend it gladly to your memories, trusting of this beginning that ye shall proceed and grow to perfect literature, and come at the last to be great clerks. *And lift up your little white hands* for me, which prayeth for you to God, to whom be all honour, and imperial majesty and glory. Amen."[1]

Erasmus was not only thoroughly at one with his friend regarding the propriety of using Christian authors in preference to the impure writings of heathen classics, but evinced his tender regard for children, by writing against the practice of flogging,[2] by composing school-books, and by doing his utmost to secure the right kind of teachers. In an amusing letter to Colet, dated from Cambridge (where Erasmus had been appointed Margaret Professor of Divinity), he tells of the ill success of his application to some of the college dons for their help in the matter. One of them sneeringly asked "Who would put up with the life of a schoolmaster, who could get his living in any other way?" When Erasmus modestly urged that he considered the education of youth the most honourable of all callings, and that no man could serve God better than by bringing children to Christ, the Cambridge doctor turned up his nose in contempt, and replied, "Whoever wishes to give himself up entirely to the service of Christ, let him enter a monastery." Erasmus ventured to ask whether St Paul did not make true religion consist rather in charity and doing as much good as possible to our neighbours; but this remark was treated as a mere proof of his ignorance. "Behold, we must leave all; in that is perfection." "*He* can scarcely be said to leave all," replied Erasmus, "who, when he has a chance of doing good to others, refuses the task because it is too humble in the eyes of the world."[3]

[1] Seebohm's Oxford Reformers, 213.

[2] Flogging for the mere purpose of breaking the will, was denounced also by Anselm, in most reasonable and instructive terms. See Church's "Anselm," p. 82.

[3] Further insight into Erasmus' regard for children, is to be gained from a perusal of the pretty colloquy, entitled "Pietas Puerilis," from which one suggestive quotation must suffice. "*Er.*—Aiunt vulgo, pueros angelicos in Satanam verti, ubi consenuerint. *Ga.*—Sed ego proverbium isthac ab autore satana natum arbitror. Imo vix existimo, senem esse vere pium, nisi qui a teneris annis assueverit. Nihil felicius discitur, quam quod ab ipsa statim pueritia discitur."

Of Erasmus' writings, the two which produced the greatest sensation, and exercised the mightiest influence, were the "Colloquies" and "The Praise of Folly." Clever and easy, like everything he wrote, full of learned allusion, and yet hitting straight at the faults of his own age, the "Colloquies" also reveal considerable dramatic power. The sparkling dialogues are maintained by characters who live in our memory as substantially and familiarly as those of Shakespeare or Scott. The dialogues are not launched with the exquisite grace of the Platonic masterpieces, but they are vigorous from first to last, and are probably as lively reading as any that remains to us from that period. What was said of one of our greatest talkers, may be said of the writer of the "Colloquies," that "he winds into his subject like a serpent." There is no appearance of effort; he seems to carry a light which makes obvious to him what other men have groped after. He finds natural utterance for what all other men have been trying to say. Under the smile that ripples everywhere on his page, and that now and again breaks into uncontrollable laughter, he is still profoundly in earnest, and each sentence is alive with a real purpose. We may read many "Histories of the Reformation," and derive from them all less real knowledge of the church and society which needed reforming, than we gain from a pleasant hour or two with the "Colloquies."

But his most pungent and popular satire was the "Praise of Folly"—a satire so popular, that during his own life-time no fewer than twenty-seven editions[1] were called for, and so pungent, that an ecclesiastic in Constance hung up the author's portrait in his room, that he might have the satisfaction of daily spitting in the face of the man who had so galled his order. The origin of this piece was very simple. On his journey from Italy to England, his thoughts naturally turned to the cultivated men whose society he hoped shortly to enjoy there, and it occurred to him as an odd coincidence, that the word *more* should in Greek signify a fool, and should at the same time be the surname of the wisest and wittiest man of his acquaintance. This seems to have led him to think of the large number of persons who were fools, not in name, but in reality; and while passing these in review, he perceives how

[1] The first of these appeared in 1511, and consisted of 1800 copies; other editions were very much larger.

truly Folly is queen over a large part of human affairs. Arriving in England, too much knocked up to apply himself to more serious studies, he beguiled the days in the absence of his congenial host, Sir Thomas More, by writing down the thoughts that had occurred to him on his journey. "It was not done with any grave design, or any view of publication; but he knew his friend More was fond of a joke, and he wanted something to do, to take his attention from the weariness of the pain he was suffering. So he worked away at his manuscript."[1] In one week the whole was completed.

The plan of the work gives the author the widest range for his satire. Folly is introduced in her cap and bells, declaiming to her ass-eared votaries, and extolling herself as the mistress of human affairs. Under this slight mask Erasmus passes in review all the varieties of fools and follies in the world; the dicing, hunting, antiquarian, saint-worshipping fools, are all sketched in a few sharp lines. He hits off the pretenders who after long patching at a speech call it extempore, and swear they wrote it in a hurry; those who interlard their sentences with Greek they cannot construe; those who nod and smile when they hear anything unusual, that they may be thought to apprehend that of which perhaps they do not understand a word. Taking a wider sweep, Folly claims that she gives all the stimulus to great action, for is it not Folly that blinds men to the emptiness of the world's rewards, and leads them to distinguish themselves that they may have a statue in the market-place? Consider, too, the miseries and indignities of human life, miseries so great that we cannot but commend the Pythagorean cock, which had passed through life as a man, a woman, a fish, a horse, and a frog, and after this large experience, declared that man was the most wretched and deplorable of all creatures. What but Folly can blind men to these miseries? Is not Folly therefore an essential of our nature?

"We may as well," says Folly, "call a horse unhappy, because he was never taught grammar, or an ox miserable because he was never taught to fence, as call a man unfortunate for being a fool, for this is what nature and providence have ordained him to be." . . . . "Self-confidence is a folly, and yet take away this one property of a fool, and the orator shall become as dumb and silent as the pulpit he stands in; the musician

[1] Seebohm.

shall hang up his untouched instrument on the wall; the completest actors shall be hissed off the stage; the painter shall himself vanish into an imaginary landscape; and the physician shall want food more than his patients do medicine. In short, without self-love, instead of beautiful you shall think yourself an old hag of fourscore; instead of eloquent, a mere stammerer; instead of well-bred and gentlemanly, a downright clown; it being so necessary that every one should think well of himself before he looks for the good opinion of others. Happiness is nothing else than a contentment to be just what we are, and this is effected by self-love, which so flushes men with a good conceit of their own, that no one thinks ill of his shape, of his wit, of his education, of his country, so that the half-drowned Hollander would not exchange his country for the sunny plains of Italy, nor the Scythian quit his desert to become an inhabitant of the Fortunate Islands. . . . . Upon this account it is that the English challenge the prerogative of having the handsomest women, of being the most accomplished in music, and of keeping the best tables; the Scotch brag of their gentility, and pretend that the genius of their soil inclines them to be good disputants; the French think themselves remarkable for their good breeding," and so on.

The satire of Erasmus belongs rather to the school of Lucian and Goldsmith, than to that of Juvenal and Swift. At least there is in the "Colloquies" and the "Praise of Folly," the same playful raillery and the same keen exposure of vice and ignorance which delight the reader of the "Dialogues" or the "Citizen of the World." Certainly we miss the turns of deep pathos and the touches of tender humanity, which have made all men love the thriftless, scrambling, generous Irishman; but we happily miss also the fixed scorn that disfigures the pages of Swift, and the somewhat overdone and self-conscious indignation which, while it gives brilliance to the style, lessens the moral power of Juvenal's satire. Erasmus depends upon ridicule as exclusively as Horace. He excites contempt, not indignation, against the objects of his satire. He laughs ill-doers out of countenance, and leaves it to others to use the lash. Neither is he a buffoon who makes fun of everything, nor a mocker who sneers at what is good as well as at what is corrupt; but he is discriminating, and merits the praise which has been accorded with less justice to another, that "no satirist has to answer for fewer attacks on what is valuable."

Satirists have been accused of affecting alarm at the consequences of their own freedom. One of our keenest classical critics, G. A. Simcox, has exposed the "comic mixture of vanity and cowardice," in Persius protesting against a

persecution he had done nothing to provoke, and anticipating a martyrdom he was never to undergo.[1] Horace records how he took advice of his friend Trebatius, the lawyer, regarding those who threatened him with an action at law, because he was "nimis acer, et ultra legem" in his satire. Voltaire seems to have considered Erasmus guilty of the same species of timidity, for he introduces him (in his dialogue between Lucian, Erasmus, and Rabelais), excusing himself for not taking the same liberties as Lucian, on the following ground: "Vous n'aviez affaire qu' a des dieux qu' on jouait sur le theâtre, et a des philosophes qui avaient encore moins de crédit que les dieux; mais, moi, j'etais entouré de fanatiques, et j'avais besoin d'une grande circonspection pour n'être pas brulé par les uns ou assassiné par les autres."[2] But Erasmus was never seriously disturbed by the violent threats of his enemies, though undoubtedly he was at times in danger. He rather, indeed, makes a jest of the danger, saying that it is hazardous to satirise the divines, "for they are a sort of men very hot and passionate, and should I provoke them, I doubt they would set upon me and force me to recant." But while he was not deterred from writing by fear of actual violence, he was more annoyed than he need have been by the violent language the monks used against him. He had none of the self-reliant vigour of our own burly moralist, who could say, "Who the plague is hurt with all this nonsense? and how is a man the worse, I wonder, in his health, purse, or character, for being called Holofernes?" So hurt was he by an attack made upon him from a pulpit in Louvaine, that he demanded a meeting with his assailant, Nicolas Egmondanus, prior of the Dominicans. Of this meeting he writes a very amusing account to Sir Thomas More.[3] For want of space we must refer those of our readers who wish to see this, to Drummond's "Erasmus" (ii. 52), or to Froude's Essays on Erasmus and Luther.

The history of Erasmus' "magnum opus," his edition of the Greek Testament, or "Novum Instrumentum," is tolerably well known. It has been told by Mill,[4] who, though not uniformly accurate, has done more than any other critic in

[1] Simcox's "Juvenal," Introduction, p. xviii.
[2] Œuvres de Voltaire, ed. 1827, vol. ii. p. 1932.
[3] Ep., p. 721. [4] "Nov. Test." Proleg., 1116–1141.

collating the different editions of the work, and affords material for more recent writers on "Introduction." Wetstein, while acknowledging the services rendered by Mill, gives an independent and interesting account[1] of Erasmus', as indeed of all the editions preceding his own. The useful manuals of Scrivener and Tregelles have made the leading facts familiar to readers of such literature, and have given fair estimates of the importance of the work. But by non-professional readers, and those who are not in search of mere technical details, the well-informed and thoughtful narrative of Mr Seebohm will be most highly relished.

Probably a little too much has been made of Erasmus' own expression regarding the rapidity with which this volume was compiled, that it was "præcipitatum verius quam editum." It is with surprise we find so careful a writer as Mr Scrivener using the following language: "It is almost painful to be obliged to remember that a portion of ten months at the utmost, could have been devoted by Erasmus to the text, the Latin version, and the notes;"[2] and even Wetstein is too absolute in his assertion, "Quod nimis festinanter tale ac tantum negotium susceptum gesserit." It is of course natural that Mill, who had given thirty years of toil to his own edition, and Wetstein, who had from his boyhood chosen the editing of the Greek Testament as the great work of his life, should feel hurt at any one who did the same work in a slim and insufficient manner. But though Erasmus did not give himself so early and so undividedly to this same work, there is abundant evidence, that from the time of his acquaintance with Colet, he meant that all his other studies should subserve the work of making the Bible known and understood. Thus we find him, in 1504 or 1505, writing, "I cannot tell you, dearest Colet, how, by hook and by crook, I struggle to devote myself to the study of sacred literature,—how I regret everything which either delays me or detains me from it." Then, after relating how he had attempted something on Paul's epistles, and had found his Greek defective, and had in consequence devoted himself for the three past years to the study of that language, he goes on thus:

"Although, however, I may for a while be engaged upon an humble

[1] "Nov. Test." Proleg, p. 120 [2] Scrivener's "Introduction," 296.

task, yet whilst thus working in the garden of the Greeks, I am gathering much fruit by the way for the time to come, which may hereafter be of use to me in sacred studies. For I have learned this by experience, that without Greek one can do nothing in any branch of study; for it is one thing to conjecture, and quite another thing to judge,—one thing to see with other people's eyes, and quite another thing to believe what you see with your own."[1]

Seven years after this, in July 1512, he writes to Colet again, that he has completed his collation of the Greek Testament, and in the remarkable letter which he wrote to Servatius two years later,[2] he claims to have corrected the text of the whole New Testament, and to have made annotations, "not without theological value," on more than one thousand places. "I have also commenced commentaries on St Paul's epistles, which I shall finish when the others are published; for I have made up my mind to work at sacred literature to the day of my death." The knowledge of this fact, that at least ten years had been spent in preparatory labour, must considerably modify our opinion of the haste with which the work was executed. It is obvious that he already had his material pretty well in shape, and that the idea of this publication did not come upon him suddenly. That the work was sent through the press far too hurriedly, every one will admit.

If any one repeats the question of Wetstein, "Quomodo ipsam festinationem excusavit, aut quis ipsum eo adegit ut festinaret?" the answer is best given by those very citations which Wetstein himself makes from the letters of Erasmus. On the 17th April 1515, Beatus Rhenanus writes to him on behalf of the great printer Frobenius, and invites him to issue his Greek Testament from the Basle press. "Petit Frobenius, Novum abs te Testamentum habere, pro quo tantum se daturum pollicetur, quantum alius quisquam." And on the 30th of the same month, the application is renewed. It is generally understood, that the urgency of Froben was prompted by his desire to anticipate the publication of the Complutensian edition; a desire in which he was gratified, for though the Complutensian New Testament was *printed* early in the year 1514, the publication of it was delayed till 1522. It was

[1] The above is Seebohm's translation.

[2] Dated from Hammes Castle, 9th July 1514.

this rivalry which occasioned one of those memorable passages in literary history, which, though every one knows, every one likes to recall. When Stunica found that the edition on which he had laboured under Cardinal Ximenes was anticipated, he attempted to depreciate the work of Erasmus, but was rebuked by his chief, in words which are as immortal as the Polyglot, "I would that all might thus prophesy; produce what is better, if thou canst; do not condemn the industry of another."

During the summer of 1515, Erasmus repaired to Basle. The printing, however, cannot have begun before September, as the letters of Erasmus shew that in that month it was still undecided whether the Latin version should be printed in parallel columns with the Greek (as eventually it was, and in very beautiful type), or in a separate volume. In the beginning of March 1516, the volume made its appearance, a marvel of rapid work; for although Erasmus lightened the labour, by simply correcting one of the Greek codices,[1] and sending it to the printers as copy, and although he received not only the scholarly aid which the printing office of Froben could always supply, but also that of Œcolampadius, as his corrector of the press,[2] it is to be considered that, during this same winter, he was engaged in several other heavy literary undertakings. Unfortunately the results of this rapid printing are too apparent. Mill speaks of the "menda, quibus scatet, typographica;" Scrivener says, that in this respect it is "the most faulty book" he knows; and Wetstein gives examples which certainly reflect no credit on the carefulness of Œcolampadius. It appears, also, that the best MS. of the gospels within his reach was overlooked by him. This was the MS. known as E Codex Basiliensis, and which had been given in 1431 to a religious house in Basle, by Cardinal John

[1] The MS. thus used, is that known as Cod. Basil. B., vi. 25. It belongs to the fifteenth century, and had been bought, Wetstein tells us, by the preaching friars of Basle, for two Rhenish florins; and "dear enough at the money, in Michaelis' judgment." It contains the four gospels. Wetstein gives specimens of the corrections made by Erasmus on the margin.—"Nov. Test." Proleg., p. 44.

[2] The words of Froben's prefatory note are worth quoting: "Nec meis laboribus peperci nec pecuniis. Quin et precibus et praemiis egi, ut castigatores adessent complures, haud vulgari doctrina præditi, et in primis Joannes Oecolampadius Vinimontanus, praeter integritatis ac pietatis commendationem, insignis etiam theologus, triumque linguarum egregie peritus, ipso quoque Erasmo in hanc partem advigilante."

de Ragusio. Its antiquity was much overrated by Mill, whose knowledge of it was second-hand (and who also erroneously thought that Erasmus had made use of it), but Wetstein refers it to the ninth century, while Scrivener concludes that it was written about the middle of the eighth century. Of the five MSS. which he did make use of, none belonged to an earlier period than the tenth century.[1] And where his MSS. altogether failed him, he did not scruple to create a Greek text, by translating from the Vulgate.

Still, with all its imperfections, this edition effected the purpose of Erasmus, which was to begin the great work of discovering and circulating the true text of Scripture. He recognised the superior value of ancient MSS.; he led the way in boldly adhering to MS. authority in critical passages, such as 1 John v. 7; and thus, and by his own Latin version, he exploded the authority of the Vulgate. Even the Complutensian editors shared in the vulgar veneration for this version, as may be seen from the language they use regarding their arrangement of the Old Testament page. In this page in their edition, the Vulgate occupies the central column, the Hebrew and the Septuagint being on either side; this they compare to the position of Christ as crucified between two thieves,—"the unbelieving synagogue of the Jews, and the schismatical Greek Church." We admire the intelligence and courage of Erasmus the more, when we find another scholar writing thus: "What if it be contended that the sense, as rendered by the Latin version, differs in truth from the Greek text? Then, indeed, adieu to the Greek. I adhere to the Latin, because I cannot bring my mind to believe that the Greek are more correct than the Latin codices."[3]

[1] For a full account of these MSS., see either Wetstein's "Prolegomena," or Scrivener's "Introduction."

[2] This was scarcely so reprehensible as his practice of amending his Greek MSS. from the Vulgate, where he *thought* them defective. He thus introduced the thirty-seventh verse of Acts xiii., and in the ninth chapter he inserted the clauses of the fifth and sixth verses, which are recognised as spurious, but which have nevertheless maintained their place in the Textus Receptus through all these years. It is extraordinary how quickly a kind of sacredness attached to the printed text of the New Testament; so that, as Tregelles observes, "the readings originally edited on most insufficient MS. authority, were supposed to possess some prescriptive right, just as if (to use Dr Bentley's phrase), an apostle had been the compositor."

[3] The results which flowed from the exclusive use of the Vulgate, are illustrated by the well-known incident in the Convocation of 1512, when an

No one can read the "Paraclesis," which Erasmus prefixed to his Greek Testament, or the annotations he appended to it, or the address to the pious reader which prefaces his "Paraphrases," without recognising that he was not more interested in his work as a scholar than as a Christian, and that if he expected that the literary success of his book would be great, his hope was that it would bring Christ and His people into a more real contact and communion. None of his writings are more worthy of a perusal, or speak more directly and forcibly than these. They are the utterances of a mind that has long been full of the subject, illustration follows on illustration, argument on argument, to persuade men to the study of the New Testament, and especially of the gospels:

"No anxious preparatory learning," he says, "is needful. Only bring a pious and open heart. The sun itself is not more common and open to all than the teaching of Christ. For I utterly dissent from those who are unwilling that the sacred Scriptures should be read by the unlearned, translated into their vulgar tongue, as though Christ had taught such subtleties that they can scarcely be understood even by a few theologians, or as though the strength of the Christian religion consisted in men's ignorance of it. The mysteries of kings it may be safer to conceal, but Christ wished His mysteries to be published as openly as possible. I wish that even the weakest woman should read the Gospel—should read the epistles of Paul. And I wish these were translated into all languages, so that they might be read and understood, not only by Scots and Irishmen, but also by Turks and Saracens. To make them understood, is surely the first step. It may be that they might be ridiculed by many, but some would take them to heart. I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with his stories the tedium of his journey." And again, "If the footprints of Christ be anywhere shewn to us, we kneel and adore. Why do we not rather venerate the living and breathing picture of Him in these books? If the vesture of Christ be exhibited, where will we not go to kiss it? Yet were His whole wardrobe exhibited, nothing could represent Christ more vividly and truly than these evangelical writings. Statues of wood and stone we decorate with gold and gems, for the sake of Christ. They only profess to give us the form of His body; these books present us with a living image of His most holy mind. Were we to have seen Him with our own eyes, we should not have so intimate a knowledge as they give of Christ, speaking, healing, dying, rising again, as it were in our own actual presence."

---

old divine urged as proof, that heretics should be put to death, the command of Paul to Titus (iii. 10). "Haereticum hominem devita," which he understood to signify "de vita tollere."

There cannot be two opinions, then, about Erasmus' services in the revival of letters and in the Reformation. His intelligence, his judgment, his industry, his influence, were surpassed by no one of his contemporaries. He was constantly writing, and all that he wrote was eagerly read. It was Goldsmith's characteristic complaint, "Whenever I write anything, I think the public *make a point* to know nothing about it." Erasmus could complain of no such neglect. Few authors have found in their own lifetime so large an audience, or have seen such manifest results of their writings. While Calvin was learning to prattle in the patois of Picardy, while Tyndale was hanging about Oxford, uncertain as to his future, while even Luther was as yet but groping for light, Erasmus was collating manuscripts of the New Testament, advocating its translation into all vernaculars, and writing annotations to explain its sense to the people. He had already spoken so plainly to two popes about the necessity of reform, and had published, in his own telling and popular style, an exposure of Romish corruptions so formidable, that his writings were placed on the Index. No one can read his "Colloquies," no one can remember that they were the most popular reading of all classes in Europe at that time, without believing that to the author of this book the Reformation, in great part, owed its success. Once for all by this and other daring publications, the fear and superstitious reverence which had been the bulwark of the religious orders were broken through and abolished, and the difference between true godliness and a religion of ceremonial was brought clearly and indelibly before the mind of the people.

But no testimony to the important part played by Erasmus is so convincing as the fact, that no sooner did Luther begin his work, than Erasmus was at once charged with having suggested to the Reformer his leading ideas, and with being the real author of all the disturbances in the Church. So constantly was this charge repeated, that the letters of Erasmus are full of remonstrances against the injustice of those who made it. Thus he writes to Cardinal Wolsey:

"As to Luther, he is altogether unknown to me, and I have read nothing of his but two or three pages, not because I despise him, but because my own studies and occupations did not give me leisure; and yet, as I hear, there are persons who affirm that I helped him. If he

hath written well, the praise belongs not to me; and if he hath written ill, I ought not to bear the blame, since in all his works there is not a line that came from me. His life and conversation are universally commended; and it is no small prejudice in his favour that his morals are unblameable, and that calumny itself can fasten no reproach upon him. If I had really been at leisure to peruse his writings, I am not so conceited of my own abilities as to pass a judgment on the performances of so considerable a divine; though wise children in this knowing age will pronounce that this is erroneous, and that heretical."

Such is his uniform, constantly reiterated reply, when besought or commanded to prove his orthodoxy by attacking Luther:

"I would not hesitate," he says, "to die without confession, were I as free from all vices as I am uncontaminated by Lutheranism." Again: "I have cursorily turned over some pages of his writings, and have recognised in him gifts well fitted to serve the cause of religion, if he employed his abilities to the glory of the Saviour. As many atrocious crimes were charged upon him, and some of them manifest lies, I wished that if he were at fault in some things, he should be amended, not made away with" [handed over, as he elsewhere says, not to the hangman, but to the theologians]. "If this be favouring Luther, I frankly own that I favour him, and so doth the pope, and so do you all, if you be true divines, and, indeed, if you be true Christians."[1]

Here, then, it will be observed, is the first reason for Erasmus being neutral. He was busy with his own work—work which he conceived to be too important to admit of his forsaking it to entangle himself in party strife. He had useful work of his own to do, and he was provoked that he should be summoned from the work he had chosen, to work which he detested. A very slight acquaintance with his letters, however, shews that there was another reason for his not joining the Reformers:

"I have refused the bribes which men in power have offered me, that I should write against Luther; and I would rather lose what I have than write to please any one contrary to my own conviction. It is no vulgar crime to betray the Gospel of Christ for money. But I have declined to give my name to Luther's party, both for many other reasons, and also because there occur in his books some passages I do not understand, and some which I cannot approve of; and especially because I have become aware, that in his party there are men whose character and efforts are very far from being in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel."

---

[1] Most of these passages, and many others, will be found in Jortin.

To Melanchthon he complains of Luther's violence, and asks how many of the princes and ecclesiastics against whom he has written, have been turned by his words to the pursuit of holiness. He believed that milder measures should first have been tried; physicians do not resort to severe measures till milder treatment has failed. He refuses to listen to those who plead that such a course was useless, and bids them remember the Greek proverb, that it is better to let an evil alone than to apply unsuitable remedies. To what extent he was right we can never know. Whether it was a wholly baseless hope, to expect that men like himself, Warham, Colet, More, and Vitrarius, might effect much in the way of reform within the Church, we cannot say. But that it was natural for Erasmus, who lived among these men, and knew the healthiness and power of their influence, to expect that something might result from their protests, no one can deny. Neither can any one be surprised that the author whose works were the most popular of the day, and who saw that his popularity rested mainly on the circumstance that he pleaded for reform, should have been led to believe that such reform might be gained. We believe the hope was vain. We believe that the death of More, and the petty persecution which drove Colet into retirement, must have taught even Erasmus that no reform from within the Church could be looked for. But before he learned this, he was hopelessly separated from the Lutherans.

There was still another reason which perhaps operated most powerfully of all in holding Erasmus aloof from the Reformers. He has been claimed as the precursor of the modern spirit, the Broad Churchman of the sixteenth century, the apostle of free thought. It is quite a study to observe how Mr Drummond is divided in his mind, not knowing whether to claim Erasmus as a pronounced Arian, or as the herald of deliverance from all dogmatism. If Mr Drummond had been wise, he would not have hesitated to relinquish the former in favour of the latter claim. But there seems to be an idea abroad, that so long as dogmatism is not orthodox, it is not dogmatism. To be a Trinitarian is dogmatic; to be an Arian is to be imbued with "the modern spirit." And so Mr Drummond thinks he may safely claim Erasmus both as an Arian and as a man who had no theological opinions whatever.

We must pause for a moment to protest against his insinuation that Erasmus leant towards Arianism. The passages which he cites (ii. 162), in proof of this, are from the Colloquy entitled "Inquisitio de Fide," and are in the following words: "The Son also is God, but of God the Father. But the Father alone is of none, *and obtains the principal place among the divine persons.*" The other passage is an answer to the question, "Why is the Father alone called God in the apostles' creed?" and is as follows:

"Because He is simply the author of all things that are, and the fountain of all Deity. For nothing can be named whose origin does not flow from the Father; and to Him even the Son and the Holy Spirit owe their Divinity. Accordingly the chief authorship, that is, the principle of origination, resides in the Father alone, because He alone is of none. Nevertheless, the creed may be thus understood, that the name of God is not personal but generical, and is afterwards distributed by the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in one God; which word expressive of nature, comprehends the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, that is, three persons."

Now, if this be the Arianism of the "Theological Review," we are sincerely glad to hear it. But we should like to know from whom Mr Drummond has taken his notions of Trinitarian doctrine; for on turning to Waterland (vol. ii. 401), we find him professing precisely what Mr Drummond considers to border on Arianism:

"Supremacy of order," he says, "consists in this: that the Father has His perfection, dominion, &c., from none; but the Son *from the Father*. All that the Son has is referred up to the Father, and not *vice versa*. This kind of supremacy is of the Father alone; and the Son's subordination thus understood, is very consistent with His equality of nature, dominion, perfection, and glory, according to all antiquity."

And when Waterland is asked (ii. 97), why the creeds style the Father the one only God, his answer is identical with that of Erasmus. "The Father is, as it were, the top of unity, the head and fountain of all." Or if we turn to the other great writer, whom every student of Trinitarian doctrine might be expected to consult, we find that Bull lays down this thesis regarding the subordination of the Son to the Father:

"Filium eandem quidem naturam divinam cum Patre communem habere, sed a Patre communicatam; ita scilicet ut Pater solus naturam

illam divinam a se habeat, sive a nullo alio; Filius autem a Patre; proinde Pater divinitatis, quae in Filio est, fons, origo, ac principium sit."[1]

But even had Erasmus enounced and defended Arian propositions, the fact would have been of no significance, because he lost no opportunity of shewing that doctrinal theology had no interest to him. He was willing to accept as his creed whatever the Church enjoined. "I know not what weight the authority of the Church has with other men," so he writes to his friend Pirckheimer (p. 960), "but with me its weight is such that I could think with Arians and Pelagians, if the Church had given its approbation to their doctrine." It is not of such stuff that theologians are made. The natural tendency of his mind was not towards abstract thought; and this natural incapacity for philosophy and theology was converted into a hearty contempt and dislike by the dry, barren, hair-splitting, merely verbal teaching, which was current in his college-days. He left college, not caring to make up his mind about the more abstruse doctrines, conscious that he could never very decidedly take up one position rather than another regarding them, and fearing that, if he should adopt any definite opinion, it might turn out to be heretical. In this state of mind he met Colet, who was then passing through an intellectual conversion, common enough in this century, but extraordinary and most significant in the end of the fifteenth. By this conversion Colet was passing over from reliance on the mass of theological dogmas, which the schoolmen and fathers had built up, to reliance on the simple historical facts recorded in the Gospels, and to the natural expressions of the Apostolic letters, which brought him "not to an endless web of propositions, to the acceptance of which he must school his mind, but to a Person Whom to love, in Whom to trust, and for Whom to work."[2] He had found sure standing ground in the Incarnation and Life of Christ, in the few facts on which our religion rests, and which have made salvation for us; and standing here, he could patiently wait till the mists which rolled everywhere around him, should lift and shew him what yet he saw not. He became,

[1] Bull's "Def. Fid. Nic.," p. 3.

[2] The whole account of Colet's mental growth, and indeed of the entire movement, as given by Seebohm, is extremely interesting and valuable.

in short, a Broad Churchman of the best type. Firmly believing the Gospel history, deeply imbued with the spirit of Christ and the apostles, he declined to turn attention to doctrine, except in so far as the reception of hope in God and the practice of a pure and high morality involved the belief of those few fundamental doctrines which are implicated in the facts of the Incarnation and Death of Christ.

The influence exerted by Colet on Erasmus, may best be gathered from the following colloquy, entitled "Pietas Puerilis," in which Erasmus and Gaspar talk over some of the matters which concern the lads, and among these the choice of a profession:

"*Erasmus.* Many nowadays abstain from theology, because they fear that they may waver in the catholic faith, seeing as they do that there is nothing which is not called in question. *Gaspar.* For my part I believe firmly what I read in Holy Scriptures and the Apostles' Creed, I don't trouble my head about anything else [nec ultra scrutor]. I leave the rest to be discussed and defined by theologians, if they please. And if the Christian people use any custom which does not manifestly conflict with Scripture, I observe it, that I may not stumble any one. *Er.* What Thales taught you this philosophy? *Ga.* When a boy I lived in the house of John Colet. He imbued me with these precepts."

It was only by slow steps that Erasmus came round to Colet's position; but in 1522 (and not then for the first time) we find him saying:

"You will not be damned for not knowing whether the Spirit proceeds from one origin only, or from both the Father and the Son; but nothing will avail to save you, if you have not cultivated the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, goodness, temperance, meekness, purity, truth. Not that I think all investigation of supra-mundane things is to be condemned, but only that he who undertakes this task, should be by nature fitted for it, and should avoid rashness in defining, and an opinionative dogmatism, and above all, that lust of victory, which is the bane of all concord."

This occurs in the preface to Hilary;[1] the whole of which should be studied, as containing the ablest defence of a brief creed, and a very temperate and well-toned discussion of the natural history and proper sphere of minute doctrinal definitions. And when we speak of Erasmus as conceiving a disgust

[1] Ep. 1631. [The present writer's references to the letters are to the London edition, 1642.]

for theology, it must be borne in mind, that the theology which was chiefly pressed upon his attention was the theology of scholasticism, which was certainly open to all the charges he brought against it. Not the science in itself, but the mode of teaching it, was what he condemned—a mode of teaching which in his own words, "stripped this queen of sciences of all her beauty, and exhibited that theology which was once most venerable and full of majesty, now almost dumb, poor, and in rags." He resented precisely what all right-thinking theologians have resented, that their science should be identified with questions such as these:

"Whether God could have taken upon Himself the nature of a woman, a devil, an ass, a gourd, or a stone? *What* Peter would have consecrated if he had consecrated the Eucharist at the moment that the body of Christ was hanging on the cross?"[1]

And the kind of subtlety of definition he complained of was this:

"The apostles spoke of 'grace,' but they never distinguished between 'gratiam gratis datam,' and 'gratiam gratificantem.' They preached charity, but did not distinguish between charity 'infused' and 'acquired,' nor did they explain whether it was an accident or a substance, created or uncreated. They abhorred sin, but I am a fool if they could define scientifically what we call sin, unless, indeed, they were inspired by the spirit of the Scotists."[2]

It is a great matter when men condescend upon instances, and do not content themselves with general statements which may mean a great deal or nothing at all. If all men who cry out against doctrinal theology, would follow the example of Erasmus, and say definitely what they allude to and have in their mind when they so speak, some of the popular illusions of our time might be dissipated. Erasmus knew his own mind; he had not attained to that sentimental laudation of the spirit of doubt which characterises our own day, nor had he learned to prize investigation more highly than the truth it discovers. He declined to express an opinion on many points of theology, but he was too clear-headed a man to esteem doubt more highly than ascertained truth. He had not imbibed "our lofty new idea of rational freedom as freedom from conviction, and of emancipation of understanding as

[1] "Praise of Folly." [2] "Praise of Folly," Seebohm, 197.

emancipation from the duty of settling whether important propositions are true or false."

But to return. What Erasmus said of himself was perfectly true. He was not a theologian; and he could not become one. A theologian *nascitur non fit.* And to invite him to write controversial pieces, or to take a lead in ecclesiastical movements was a mistake; as it is a mistake now to judge him by the lives of other men, and condemn him because he was himself, and not Luther or Zuingle. As Mr Drummond very justly remarks, "In order to do justice to Erasmus, we must not contrast him with Luther, but rather consider what his own work was, and how far he would have improved its prospects of success by declaring for Luther." He served his generation with formidable weapons and an untiring industry, and were it possible to distribute to every man who had a part in the Reformation his own share of merit, it may well be questioned whether any one would have a larger share than Erasmus. But his work was not the formation of doctrinal opinion or belief. His best friends must be rather ashamed of the weakness of this side of his mind. The most ardent advocates of a restricted creed must believe that such few opinions as a man does profess he should honestly and consistently maintain. But Erasmus may very easily be convicted of shilly-shallying, notoriously so in regard to the sacramental doctrine of Œcolampadius. Plutarch, in his life of Nicias, tells of an Athenian politician who gained for himself the nickname of *The Buskin,* having that easy adaptability to whatever might be the dominant power, which characterised our own vicar of Bray. And the reader of Erasmus is reluctantly forced to the conclusion that his carelessness about doctrinal theology led him sometimes to utter opinions which at other times he disavowed. His error did not consist in his declining to have anything to do with subjects he disliked and for which he felt himself naturally disqualified, but it consisted in his denying his own nature, and at length taking up the pen in the very quarrels he had spent his life in denouncing. Few spectacles could have been more useful to that or any age than that of a man of his capacity and learning asserting his right to know nothing but the historical data of Christianity, and the simple lines of truth delivered in the apostles' creed; but Erasmus terribly disappoints those

who look for such a spectacle, when he yields to the badgering of the papists, and at last enters the lists with Luther on one of the most abstruse theologico-philosophical problems.

The question that results from the consideration of Erasmus' neutral attitude is this: Ought a man in every great conflict to take a side? To say that a man must in every such case take a side, implies that of two sides, one must be right and the other wrong, which is frequently not the case, the truth being almost equally distributed between them. But in the instance before us, it will be said, that one side was right, or so much nearer right than the other, that it was a weakness not to take a side. Certainly it would have been a weakness had Erasmus merely held aloof, to see how the strife would end, and then join the stronger party, or had he vacillated and been unable to make up his mind on the matters in dispute; but it must be borne in mind, that Erasmus had his own clearly defined view as to reforming the Church, that his method was theoretically the better of the two, that he had been working at it consistently and with all his might for thirty years; that during that time he had seen considerable results achieved, and that his expectation that a complete reform would be carried through was assuredly not unreasonable. The blame must lie, not with him, but with those who, exasperated as Erasmus thought by the violence of Luther, ultimately refused the reforms he sought. They who drove Luther out of the Church, and listened to no remonstrance from within it, are the parties responsible as well for the bloodshed, misery, and revolution which followed the Reformation, as for the ignorance and superstition which in Catholic countries have become identified with Christianity. Erasmus, as we have said, was mistaken, but his was the error of a man who thought too well of human nature. He expected inveterate abuses to be removed by those whose interest it was to maintain them. He expected that a community, which had grown to be a mighty political institution, would accept the position of the Apostolic Church, and at the voice of his persuasion, meekly return to her youthful and primitive ways. In the idea of some, it might as rationally have been expected that Napoleon, after tasting empire, should have returned to a lieutenancy of artillery. He miscalculated the strength of his weapon, and omitted to consider that the

masses of the people must have an outward movement to quicken and fix their inward convictions. And above all, though it might be unwise to say that he overrated the value of peace, yet he certainly underrated the use of violence, and had therefore to learn the lesson which has been adequately expressed in the words of a living writer, who has profoundly studied at least one great revolution of opinion; that "those whom temperament or culture has made the partisans of calm order, cannot attune progress to the stately and harmonious march which would best please them, and which they are perhaps right in thinking would lead with most security to the goal."

MARCUS DODS.

---

## ART. II.—*Calvinism in Modern Life.*

IN many circles of thought and life, Calvinism is decidedly unpopular. Men who agree in nothing else, agree in a hearty hatred of Calvinism. The High Churchman in his intervals of leisure between exhausting ceremonies, refreshes himself by hurling forth a denunciation of Calvin and all that is his. The Broad Churchman applies his historico-critical apparatus to the examination of this phenomenon, appraises its value as a curious manifestation of human thought and life, and quietly lays it on the shelf. He seems to think its days are over, and does not concern himself with it, save as an historical problem. Yet let Calvinism manifest itself as a living faith held with intense earnestness by living men, the Broad Churchman loses all his breadth, forgets all his politeness and courtesy, and, as has lately happened, becomes very energetic in his denunciation. Echoes of this declamatory aversion to Calvinism reach the ear from every quarter. From press and pulpit and platform; in books and quarterlies and monthlies; in weekly and daily papers we find Calvinism loaded with execration, or spurned with contempt. Much of this falls to be discounted as the merest repetition by men of a lower culture of what has filtered down to them from higher regions. But after all allowance is made, it is worth asking, Whence has arisen this great outcry?

For we find on examination, that all who esteem the

Reformation as a great and glorious epoch in the history of human progress, look on Calvinism as a faith which enabled men to battle strongly, with or without success, against dreadful odds, on behalf of civil and religious liberty. All allow that Calvinism and Calvinists had a high and stern work to do, and did it well all over Europe, for a full century after the Reformation. The heroic struggle maintained by the Dutch in the cities and swamps of Holland, the long battle of the Huguenots in France, the great conflict of the Puritans in England, and the mighty endurance of the Scotch in their long persecution under the Stewart kings, were all carried on by men who passionately held high calvinistic principles. On the issues of the conflict depended the possibility of human freedom, the rights of individual and social life, in short, all that is most precious to us all in modern life. It is not a little instructive to notice that the Calvinist, who always asserts the absolute supremacy and sovereignty of God, and who always lays stress on the nothingness of created existence in His presence, is always the stoutest and boldest champion of personal liberty. He must be free to obey and serve the Author of his being. He can permit no power to intervene between him and his God. "God alone is Lord of the conscience," asserts the Westminster Confession; and holding this with all-powerful conviction, the Calvinist cannot choose but resist any power which attempts to enter within that sacred sphere. In truth, the battle of the Reformation was in the first place a battle for the rights of conscience. But it had much wider issues than those for which the Reformers battled.

While those who are not Calvinists acknowledge the great service of Calvinism in that long stern conflict, yet they seem to think it a faith altogether unsuited to the quieter times and more complex conditions of modern existence. It was well that men engaged in a struggle for bare life should be raised almost above human conditions by a high, simple, stern, stoic faith. It was well that such men should imagine themselves to be in the full sweep of forces, which, working in time, had both their origin and their results in eternity. It was well that they supposed themselves the objects of a Divine awful choice to eternal glory, and to the terrible tribulation and protracted suffering and labour, which formed the destined way to that glad consummation. Even were they the subjects

of delusion, the anti-Calvinists could almost condone their error for the sake of the work they did, and the results which followed. But such a faith is supposed to be clearly out of place in our day. Its fundamental assumptions are supposed to be at variance with the higher views of justice, goodness, and mercy, arrived at in our cultured times. The assent it demands is considered too peremptory in an age, the characteristic of which is a delicate balancing of opposing probabilities, and whose favourite habitation is a delicious cloudland of mystic faith and doubt. It is altogether too rough for the refinement of modern life, and makes no provision for the indefinite yearnings and throbbings and aspirations of a heart nurtured on the science, literature, and art of the nineteenth century.

For religious thought and life is coming more and more to be considered a thing of circumstances and conditions. Granted a time, when men are living under the stress and strain of great events, when earnest and strenuous battle must be done for the preservation of great and worthy objects, when men are brought so near the verge of time and temporal interests, that eternity becomes near and vivid,—then Calvinism may become a powerful living force. But a time of calm and cool reflection is altogether adverse to its reception. In short, the modern opponents of Calvinism seem no more to anticipate its revival as a living influence, than they anticipate an earthquake in Hyde Park. The force which the volcano represents was no doubt very useful in the primeval state of the world. It upheaved for instance the Alpine mountains, and so was instrumental in preparing a pleasing ground of adventure and excitement for young England; it is interesting still, when it manifests itself in an eruption of Mount Vesuvius; but the idea of a great central fire lurking within the earth, a restless, moaning, imprisoned giant, ever seeking release, is by no means a pleasant conception.

The modern conception of Calvinism is that of a rough rude primeval force, admirable and useful in rough and terrible times, but altogether lacking in the elements of sweetness and light, and consequently unfitted for modern life. It might be asked, Is all the rough work of the world over and finished? Are there no more wrongs to be righted, no more cruelty and oppression to be destroyed, no throne of

iniquity yet to be cast down, no superstition to be uprooted, no ignorance to be enlightened? Would it not be well, before discarding a servant who confessedly wrought so powerfully and well in dark and troublous times, to make sure that we are now in an era of sure repose, wherein calm artistic grace and sweet persuasiveness may reign and rule? It would be a little awkward to be compelled to go forth to battle, wearing no armour but the silken folds of a peaceful doublet, and having no offensive weapons of greater weight than the harmless wand of the critic.

It may be admitted, however, that if Calvinism has no direct suitability to all the varied mental and moral needs of the present time—if it has nothing to satisfy the yearnings of the heart and the cravings of the conscience as men are now—then, however helpful and suitable the men of an older time may have found it to be, men have a right to set it aside. It was wise and right in David to refuse the armour of Saul, and go forth to life's battle with the simple weapons he had already proved. For simple truthfulness, and simplicity of heart, and an awful earnestness, are the first conditions of a right belief and a true life. But we believe no more than these is necessary in order that a man may find in Calvinism a system of moral, intellectual, and religious truth, which will meet and satisfy all the needs of human nature, trained amid the conflicting elements of the nineteenth century. Is this age an age of criticism—an age of much questioning on all sides—an age in which the ultimate problems of every subject are searched into? Then Calvinism, persuaded that it rests on eternal truth, is prepared to welcome the deepest and most searching investigation. Is this an age of science, in which the circle of the known is enlarging itself from day to day, and the domain of law and fixed succession of events is extending into spheres that once seemed to be capricious and the result of chance? Then Calvinism with joy welcomes the advance of science, for it believes itself to be the expression of the highest order, and the most supreme law. Is this an age also of passionate love of external nature—an age in which every leaf and blade of grass, every mountain and valley, everything in nature, is most passionately loved and studied with the utmost intensity? Calvinism is prepared to go hand in hand with these, for she reads that the heavens

declare the glory of God, and she has known Who it is that maketh the grass to grow upon the mountains. Calvinism has its message for every man. To the man of science, who delights to trace order and law throughout all the phenomena of the universe, it promises to disclose order and law, moving with unerring wisdom, and moulding with unfailing certainty all the events of time into a form pre-established from eternity. Calvinism promises to the keen passionate lover of beauty and purity, whose delight is in flowing forms and graceful outlines, and glory of light and shade, a revelation of the eternal Source of all glory, and all beauty, and all grace. While to the perplexed student of social science, bewildered amid the entanglement of sin and misery, the sufferings and woes of this mortal life, it promises a clue to guide him through every maze of doubt and unbelief, upwards to the heights whence the glory of the reign of truth and righteousness and holiness may be seen.

So opposed is the foregoing description of Calvinism to that commonly current, that it may be read in many circles with a feeling of amazed indignation, or contemptuous disbelief. Is not Calvinism a narrow, intense, hide-bound theory of life and conduct? Has it not been powerful, simply because of its intense narrowness of view? Is it not charged with giving forth a representation of the Divine Being, inconsistent with the simplest notions of human goodness and justice? Does it not crush and paralyse every healthy movement of honest human joy, and drive all life into a hard dry beaten track of utter lovelessness and intense barrenness of beauty, and miserable sameness of individual character? True, the modern representations of Calvinism would justify all these accusations. It is because these are most unjust that these pages are written.

What then is Calvinism? On what is it founded? It professes to found itself on Revelation. It takes for granted that a Divine Revelation is possible, and has actually been communicated unto men. Its doctrines may be in harmony with the highest philosophy; but its basis is not in philosophy, but in Revelation. Its fundamental propositions may be demonstrated by the widest induction of facts, according to the strictest methods of inductive science; but it must again be said, its authority does not depend on facts of human

experience, but on the truth of Scripture. It professes to offer ample evidence for the solution of every doubt, to meet and gratify every yearning and aspiration of the human heart; but ultimately the argument for its existence is not the satisfaction of human needs, but the higher ground of the authority of the Eternal. Calvinism rejoices in the testimony which creation affords to the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. It expatiates with extreme delight amid the events of history, as shewing the wise rule of the God of providence; but neither creation nor providence give, except indirectly and incidentally, any knowledge of the facts and doctrines of redemption. All that concerns redemption, lying as it does in a sphere to which man has no natural way of access, belongs to the heavenly things revealed by the Son of Man. On the ground of Scripture, Calvinism takes its position, and with it, it stands or falls. All aids to the exposition of the Scripture documents must be welcomed. History, psychology, grammar, the conditions and circumstances of the time when the particular revelation came, the laws of human belief, and the laws of speech, are all to be exhausted in the attempt to arrive at the knowledge of the contents of revelation. Nor is this all that is available. The Calvinist believes in the illumination of an ever-living Interpreter of Scripture. He believes, with an intense, ever-dependent faith, in the Spirit who guides into all truth. The Holy Ghost dwells in him who believes, and arouses in him the conditions of faith, and leads him into a truth which broadens and deepens and rises ever higher throughout time and eternity. A living Spirit coming into direct contact with living men, through words inspired by God, is the grand postulate of Calvinism.

But if this be so, how does Calvinism stand in relation to a criticism of the Scripture documents themselves? If the results of modern criticism be found true, must it not be admitted that there is an end of Calvinism as scriptural, though the facts of nature and history, so illustrative of the truth of Calvinism, remain unchanged? It may be answered, that Calvinism stands to modern criticism in precisely the same position as other systems of life and doctrine professedly founded on Scripture. Take away the possibility of a revelation, and you take away all that was built on the foundation of a possible communication of the Divine will to men. Take

away by a detailed criticism the separate books, shew that they are not authentic, or trustworthy, that they involve insuperable difficulties, and you destroy not Calvinism alone, but all that can claim to be called Christian. Into this arena of controversy all descend on equal terms, and it becomes a conflict, in the issue of which all are equally concerned. Nor need Calvinism be less learned, less diligent, less patient, or less tolerant of the doubts and difficulties of men who are seeking after God, than any other system of Christian doctrine. In truth, were the advocates of Calvinism wise, they would look on the criticism of the books of Scripture as one of their best and truest friends. It cannot but be an advantage to truth, that all facts should be honestly ascertained, and all that it is possible to discover regarding the externals of revelation should be accurately known. But for another reason, Calvinists are bound to be foremost and most laborious in this very important field. They are bound by their historical and theological position to recognise the worth of the human factor in any possible revelation. The revelation of God has come down to us conditioned by many circumstances. It is conditioned by the fact that it is spoken in human speech by human lips, addressed to men in such a form as they are able to apprehend. The prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; but then they were moved according to, and within the bounds of, the laws and constitution of human thought and life. And the result of inspiration issued forth, coloured by all that went to make up the personality of the inspired writers. Now, if the worth of the human element in inspiration be thus a fundamental element in Calvinism, with what gladness should it welcome any researches that tend to throw light on any or all of the circumstances which moulded the personality of the writers of Scripture. The social and political forces in the midst of which they lived and moved—the peculiar colour and tendencies of their generation—the family life in the midst of which they passed their youth—the language in which they delivered their message—these and all other matters that help men to enter into, and thoughtfully to sympathise with, the life of the teachers sent from God, are to be made the subjects of patient investigation. Thus, in its eager desire to penetrate into the inner meaning of revelation, Calvinism must itself

become critical; and though its objects are somewhat different from those of many critics, and its means not the same as theirs, and its spirit opposed to theirs in many respects, it still, so far as their labours are purely critical, can afford to regard them as labourers in the same field.

This profound conviction of the infinite worth of the human personality, and of the immense value of the characteristic differences between individual and individual, carries Calvinism triumphantly over difficulties, before which other systems must pause. The highest religious life is that which is the true outcome of the regenerated man. Like all life, it is manifold in its phases; and if a man is true to himself, his religious life must be something new in the history of Christianity, just as every man in his natural life is something different from what has heretofore occurred in the history of the world. The Greeks naturally sought after wisdom, and in Christ they found Him in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The Hebrews sought honour and glory in their Messiah, and in Christ they beheld the power and glory of the Eternal. Corresponding to that which they found in Christ, were those obstacles and difficulties which prevented them at first from resting in Him for salvation. The Jew saw dishonour in the cross, and the Greeks foolishness. In precisely the same way is the chasm which separates unbelief from faith to be bridged over in our time. To go patiently and lovingly with the doubter into the midst of all his difficulties, to travel with him his mile along the way of unbelief, and to disclose to him that his difficulties are really founded on a misapprehension of the truth, must always be reckoned one of the most commonplace duties of the Calvinist. He is bound to it by the very essence of his creed. For the doubts and fears and yearnings which form the characteristic of the man who would believe if he could, and which are the true expression of his whole nature, indicate precisely those qualities of soul and mind and heart on which the Calvinist lays special stress. If the doubts be those which are forced on him by the structure of his soul, when his faith comes, it also will be no mere hearsay belief, but the forthgoing of all his energies in the direction of a true religious life. It might thus be shewn that the relation of Calvinism to doubt is that of a loving patient friend, who stretches hands of sympathy and

encouragement across the gulf, and helps in all possible ways to lead men upwards to the sure ground of faith in Christ.

We pass from this preliminary question to those distinctive doctrines to which Calvinism has often been so unjustly limited. Here misrepresentation and ignorance have been specially busy. Distinctions laid down by every calvinistic writer from Augustine downwards—distinctions repeated in every symbolical book of any calvinistic church, are either unknown to, or ignored by those who accuse Calvinism of being subversive alike of human freedom and Divine goodness. If one wishes to disprove the truth of Calvinism, he is bound in all fairness to take its doctrines with the limitations and distinctions laid down in the works of its authoritative writers. When the questions of predestination and election and a vicarious sacrifice are discussed, it is not fair controversy to caricature these, and then to shew that the caricature is absurd. Take the doctrine of predestination, for instance, and trace its history downwards from the time of Calvin, through all the phases of controversy, and on both sides there will be found a tendency to present it in a hard skeleton form, divorced altogether from those qualifications and reservations with which it is stated in the works of Calvin. The stress of controversy has forced its advocates to carry its foundations deeper, and its results wider, than truth demands; while at the same time, its opponents have naturally fastened on those features which seemed ugliest and most revolting. For some doctrines of Calvinism may be stated in such a form that no Christian man can hold them. They may be raised into such prominence, and thrown into such a state of isolation from kindred truths, as to become untrue. That God hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass is unquestionably a tenet of Calvinism. But this doctrine is by no means a fatalistic one. Between the calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and the doctrine of a stern fate which moulds everything into an iron necessity, there is a decided contradiction. Fatalism disregards all conditions and circumstances and limitations. It looks on every sphere of existence as alike ruled by invariable necessity, and disposed by similar causes. In it there is no difference between the moral world, and the world of matter; and the actions of men are as fixed as the movements of a stone. Opposed to this in all respects is the great

calvinistic doctrine of predestination. The government of the world is a moral government. God foreknows and fore-ordains whatsoever comes to pass; but fore-ordination is one thing, as applied to the material universe, and another as applied to the actions of men. For as is so often stated in calvinistic books, in the old language of the schools, God "ordereth all things to fall out according to the nature of second causes, either necessarily, freely, or contingently." That is to say, in modern language, God has given to all His creation a certain fixed constitution, and in His government of His creatures He rules them according to the laws of their being. The material world He rules according to laws capable of being reduced to mathematical formulæ, and expressed with unerring precision. The animate world of the lower animals He rules and governs according to the wider, freer, more personal being He has bestowed on them; and when we enter into the higher world of intelligent responsible being, the mode of government changes; reason, emotion, and will, have their place; the Divine Creator and Governor condescends to reason, expostulate, and persuade. God respects the constitution of every being He has made; and every law of created existence is so far a limit which the Omnipotent has set on His mode of acting. The limitations of predestination are threefold:—1. That God is not the author of evil. 2. That the government of the world is a moral government. 3. That God acts according to the nature of second causes. These limitations are all stated in a book easily accessible to every one; and it would be very desirable that many should read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the book to which we allude. They will find all these stated in the fifth chapter of the Westminster Confession.

So understood, is not the doctrine of predestination merely an expansion to an infinite scale of some of the most common facts of human life? Man's government over nature, and man's prevision of phenomena, have widened and increased with the march of science. Nature's rudest agencies are bent and ordered at his pleasure; and the secret laws which guide her action are being disclosed year by year in greater profusion. Man learns to know the laws of matter, and by that knowledge is able to control and turn to his own advantage the forces of the universe. Widen his knowledge, and you increase his power. Extend it until it grasps all the forces of

nature in one universal law, and you empower him to rule the material universe at his pleasure. Give to him a perfect knowledge of the instincts and habits and tendencies of the lower creation, let him understand thoroughly all the emotions of the brutes, and he can predict infallibly (nay more, may he not fore-ordain with unerring certainty ?) all their actions. In the government of men also the same principle holds good. Men are governed by those who understand them; and human nature being constant, he who knows men best may predict their actions, and mould their character. Each sphere of creation according to its own constitution—inanimate things according to their nature—all the grades of organised existence up to man, each according to the laws of its being—governed and ruled and guided to their pre-destined end: this is what we behold at this hour in the vast domain of man's active energy. Instead of human imperfect action, read the Divine energy. Instead of human ignorance and weakness, read the strength of Omnipotence, and the breadth of Divine wisdom, energising freely over all the works of God, and it will be seen how the old doctrine of Calvinism has anticipated the most advanced conclusions of modern science. Adequate knowledge and adequate power are really all that seem to be needed to anticipate and control those varied forces, the sum of which make up the material universe. Without violence to the nature of any of the substances of matter, they are turned every day to the uses of man. In harmony with the instincts of the lower animals, they are ruled, governed, and changed, according to his will. Nay, do we not see a whole nation bent, moulded, swayed, persuaded to energetic action, by the supreme personality and power of some single individual ? What is this but God's highest creature, created in His image, working so far after the fashion of his Creator, and practically asserting the supremacy intended for him to exercise ?

Very fruitful is this old doctrine of second causes, had we time to pursue it here. Rightly understood, it sweeps away into utter nothingness all the popular objections against Calvinism. It obviates also the profounder objection brought against Calvinism by the scientific theologians of Lutheranism. It is objected that, if the calvinistic doctrine of predestination be true, then history is not real, but apparent; that it is improper, on calvinistic grounds, to speak of the history of the

kingdom of God; and we can only speak of the *evolution* of that kingdom. All is fixed, decided already. Existence, life, destiny—every individual man, with his distinctive lineaments of character and outward circumstances, have been already present before the eye of the Omniscient God, with a necessity as fixed and certain as the path in which the planets move. It might be asked in reply, What conception have the Lutherans of Him, with Whom a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years? Are the past events of history fixed and certain, and if so, why may not the future events of history be the objects of the Divine fore-knowledge? Does the fact, that some one has read this article, and knows that it is to be printed, interfere with the freedom of the writer? In truth, the old confusion between different spheres of existence reappears in the objection referred to above. As of the popular objection, so of the scientific it may be said that its force depends altogether on a transference of the conception of invariable law from the physical to the moral world. If the lutheran objection be true, it brings far greater and stronger charges against Calvinism than those involved in the doctrine of predestination. Not only is all history a mere evolution of phantasmal forms,—a carrying out of a phantom, dream-like struggle to issue in a phantom result,—but all the forces of secondary existence become unsubstantial, and creation itself is but a baseless vision, and men are but dreams within a dream. Neither evil nor good, right or wrong, has any existence as objective; and life is but a tale of sound and fury, signifying nothing. If the Divine predestination can only be maintained at the expense of sacrificing the reality and freedom of created existence, it is needless to say that the doctrine must be let go. But if the calvinistic doctrine seems to militate against the reality of derived existence, and to reduce it to a mere seeming, the lutheran objection on the other hand, certainly tends to reduce the Divine energy to a semblance, or at all events gives forth such a representation of the Divine Being as makes Him dependent on the will of the creature, and His government a mere watching of the actions of the beings He has made. Though unable to construe to himself the two terms of this mighty problem, or to shew in thought how the Divine energy coexists with human activity, and absolute fore-ordination with freedom and

responsibility, the Calvinist holds that both are true, and will give up neither. The lines are, to use a mathematical phrase, asymptotical. If ever they do meet, they meet in a point beyond the range of intellectual vision. As facts of revelation, the two are placed side by side; and as facts, the Calvinist is content to hold them.

So far as our statement of Calvinism has hitherto gone, it has been purposely put as it might have been held in a world in which evil was unknown. It is time now to look at the question in the light of another limitation. God is not the author of evil; yet He hath fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass. Here emerges the great fact which sooner or later emerges in every system which professes to lay hold of the facts of life. Pain ranges through all animated existence; sin and suffering appear in every generation. How does the existence of evil consist with the doctrine of predestination? We are not so presumptuous as to offer anything in the way of solution of this great mystery. The highest intellects have looked into and treated the question, and have left it as they found it. The answer of Calvinism is, that sin is due not to the Creator but to the creature. It is a result of the freedom given to men. By man's free act, "sin entered into the world, and death by sin." The keys of self-government were laid upon man's shoulder; the guidance of his destinies were in his own hands; it was possible for him to give a free obedience, but possible also to disobey. Freedom as self-determination lies at the very root of the Calvinistic idea of humanity. At all events, as he was in the state of innocency he was free; and if the power of self-determination is abridged in man as fallen, it is simply because he has permitted that power to pass out of his hands. Powerful to admit, he was powerless to expel evil. He swung open the gates of the soul, and the power of evil entered in; but to shut the gates and expel the enemy required a strength beyond humanity. He had given up his freedom, and the power of self-determination was limited, and for some ends altogether extinguished. Yet responsibility attaches to man, not only for his sin, but also for that loss of the power of self-determination, which is one of the saddest results of sin.

The problem of evil, as it presents itself in Calvinism, is mainly historical. Into the metaphysics of the question, it

does not profess to enter, nor does it pass beyond the bounds of revelation, to expatiate among the vague theories of possible worlds, wherein no evil could appear. An explanation of evil as it exists in history and in life, in the form of sin and suffering, lies ready to its hands, in the doctrine that man possessed the power of self-government, and by transgressing the bounds set him by his Creator, has incurred the penalty due to transgression. Simple as the explanation seems to be, yet it is that which in the long run obtains universal acceptance. It is the solution to which the wearied mind returns, after all other outlets have been tried, and nothing found, save the iron barriers that keep the finite within the bounds of space and time. It is therefore with evil as actual historical fact, and with man as fallen and sinful, that Calvinism has to do. The whole human family as a unity had sinned; and the results of sin as separation from God, and as wrath working on the sinful, are sadly apparent in the whole human family. Sin in its twofold aspect, as dishonouring to God and destructive to man, holds a conspicuous place in the calvinistic system. No one is competent to criticise Calvinism who refuses to apprehend its doctrine of sin. No language is sufficiently strong to express the awfulness of the estimate of sin, and the deep writhing horror of it which fill the heart of a Calvinist. The dishonour done to God, the rebellion against the Most High, the refusal to love and obey, the exceeding unloveliness and dark pollution of sin, must truly be apprehended, before one can fairly understand the scheme as a whole. And the foulness, unloveliness, and disorderliness of sin are on this view chargeable to man, and to man alone. For sin is no mere defect; not the rubbish accumulating in the long process of a larger plan; not the necessary accompaniment of a free spontaneous life; it is positive rebellion, impurity, and disorder, offensive to the purity of God, and destructive to the life of man. According to the highest conception of the character of God, He must war with sin and disorder, and regard it with that energy of His moral being, the active form of which is denominated wrath. A burning indignation against sin, yet an infinite pity for the sinner who has rendered himself the servant of sin, inflexible justice, and a love passing understanding, seem to the Calvinist to be the outstanding features in his idea of God.

Now, the estimate of sin which says that every sin "deserveth God's wrath and curse in this life and that which is to come," gives rise to the thought of an adequate atonement. Let your idea of sin be less vivid, and less full of horror than the idea described above, and your idea of an atonement will necessarily be less strong and peremptory. Make man to be the victim of circumstances, and denude him of his freedom and responsibility—let sin be his misfortune, not his fault—let evil be a necessary accompaniment of the development of life—and you may get rid of the necessity of an atonement altogether. But it is not a little curious that those who evacuate the thought of sin of almost all its contents, and who deny that it has tainted and depraved man's whole being, should also be those who shrink from attaching responsibility to man for his sin and impurity; while those who look on sin in all its ethical relations and see its deep enormity and eternal results, should also lay stress on the fact that man is responsible for all his actions. But those who deny a vicarious sacrifice, and who consequently affirm that penitence only is needed in order to procure the Divine pardon, are driven by the logical necessity of their position to diminish both the idea of human sin, and that of Divine holiness and justice. This is apparent even in a book so thoughtful and wise, so high-toned and spiritual,—a book which touches on so many sides the deeper chords of modern spiritual life, as Mr Hutton's Theological Essays. With all the vigour of his strong arm, and with all the force of his passionate soul, he hurls at Calvinism the derisive epithet of the "Hard Church." We must express our high appreciation of the worth of Mr Hutton's Essays, and in relation to the present question desire to say, would that he knew Calvinism better! For in Calvinism true and proper all his positive teaching is taken up and harmonised with all the wider truths he has forgotten to touch. His essays are like simple melodies, sweet and musical, but incomplete, of which the worth is not fully recognised until they are taken up in the sweep of a grander symphony. Sin and guilt with him take the form of doubt and baffled search after truth. The heart of man in his pages is not full of wickedness; and he seemingly has no conception of a possible delighting in evil. This is one grave defect in his Essays. The redemption he preaches is a redemption for the literary class of people, struggling with

the doubts arising from modern criticism, and perplexed amid the entanglements of modern scepticism. He speaks mainly to educated humanity, to those who are feeling after God, and striving to find Him revealing Himself through all the complexities of the present time. To use theological language, the Christ is to him the Prophet and the King, and not by any means the Priest. Christ, the revealer of the Father, in love, wisdom, pity, and power, is still the burden of every essay; but he seldom speaks of the eternal justice of God, and never of a vengeance due to sin. He dwells at great length, and with happy power, on the incarnation of Christ; but the incarnation and life have in his works more significance than the death of the Redeemer. Mr Hutton illustrates what we stated above as a common law of our nature, that corresponding to the form our difficulties and doubts assume ere we can believe in Christianity, will be the form which Christianity itself assumes when doubt has turned to faith. From his Essay on the Incarnation, we should infer that the incarnation had been to Mr Hutton the great stumbling-block in the way of his accepting Christianity as the absolutely true religion. Hence the strong emphasis which he lays on it now. But we humbly suggest to Mr Hutton, is there any necessity on his theory why Christ should die a cursed and shameful death? Is there any necessity why He should be made a curse for us? If all that is needed to "render a true penitence possible" be "to emancipate us from the despair of human weakness through the revelation of a Divine power in whose might we may trample on sin and death," might not the "revelation of a Divine power" be conceivably made at less cost to Him who came to reveal the Father? We do not lay less stress than Mr Hutton does on the incarnation, or on the revelation of Divine power and human weakness united in Christ, nor do we attach less value to true penitence; but we conceive it quite impossible to give any account of the protracted sufferings and dying agony of the Lord Jesus, which leaves out of view the truth that He suffered in the room and stead of sinners. The doctrine of the incarnation shines in all its lustre only when viewed from the standpoint of the cross. And his vigorous denunciation of the "Hard Church," will, we fear, serve ultimately to forge a weapon against his previous argument on behalf of the truth of the incarnation.

We have no wish to enter upon any question of exegesis here; but we ask Mr Hutton to look at the doctrine of Vicarious Sacrifice in the light of the social unity of humanity. "Theologically," as the late Professor Duncan so uniquely said, "there are only two men, the first and the second Adam."[1] All men stand either in Adam or in Christ; and the ultimate question regarding every man is, Has he continued to stand in Adam, or has he, in time, come to stand in Christ? The doctrine of Calvinism is, that redeemed humanity suffered with Christ on the cross, lay with Him in the grave, with Him rose, and with Him dwells at the right hand of God. There is a vital, organic union between Him and them, and the community of a common interest obtains between the Redeemer and His people. It is from an utter disregard of this vital oneness between Christ and the redeemed that Mr Hutton's indignant declamation derives all its force.

But Mr Hutton is not only angry with the idea of substitution, because of its hardness, but he charges it with causing utter artificiality in spiritual life. He falls foul here of the late Dr Candlish; and as the whole passage sums up in an emphatic way the most of the objections against Calvinism as in actual life, we quote it at length. Dr Candlish had spoken of a sinner as willing to acquiesce in the arrangement, *i.e.*, willing that his guilt should be laid on Jesus. Then Mr Hutton:

"'Willing to acquiesce in the arrangement.' If ever there were a hollow ring about theological doctrine, if ever there were an empty husk from which the kernel had dropped, it is such a formula as this. From the opinion—I will not call it a faith—that rigorous spiritual justice concerns the external act of punishment, irrespectively of the recipient; from the doctrine which professes to excuse men, once for all, from all the requisitions of theDivine law on grounds wholly disconnected with their own spiritual life, has come all that unreal and external conception of duty and of sin; that chronic suspiciousness of nature without open war with it; that askance glance at the joys of life without either hearty acceptance or manly resignation; that way of living half to the carnal, and half to the spiritual man, which combines the perils of ascetic and of epicurean practice; that official life with the Redeemer, and actual life with the world—which naturally flows from a theory of purely artificial righteousness, and from gratitude to God that we are permitted to produce a proxy in the most personal relations of spiritual life, in

[1] We quote from memory.

short, that He is pleased to admit a double dramatic fiction as the ground of a reconciliation with Himself."[1]

Truly the hardness of the "Hard Church" seems to be contagious. It is not a little strange that a man of Mr Hutton's culture and breadth of sympathy—a man who, more than any other, sets himself to find the soul of good in things evil—a man who can write with so true an appreciation of the "moral significance of Atheism," and express so happily the yearning which gives strength to "popular Pantheism," should grow so fierce, so hard, and so unsympathetic, when he touches a faith, passionately and devoutly held by many millions living at this hour. Does he not lay himself open to the charge of hardness and want of sympathy which he brings so powerfully against others? The passage quoted misstates the question so curiously, that we may well give to it a more detailed examination.

If a distinction be admitted between nature and grace, a charge of artificiality may plausibly be made against any system admitting such a distinction, at one point or other. If grace be something different from nature, and the spiritual life of man be not a mere development of natural life, and life in Christ be life on another plane than a life out of Christ, some mode of transference from natural life to spiritual must be recognised as common to all theories on the matter. Such a transference is provided in Mr Hutton's Essays, through utter and profound penitence in the human heart, and through a free pardon from God.[2] So far as it goes, the statement may be accepted as just and true. How does he account for the altered relation between God and man? By the "revelation of a triumphant power, close to, and even participating in, our sense of human helplessness." Ah, the old neglect of one of the essential elements of the question, the old way of translating sin into a sense of human helplessness! We are utterly unable to find room in this system for any distinction between nature and grace, or any provision for man's natural instinct of supreme justice, or any relief for a sin-laden conscience. On the other hand, observe how Calvinism provides for all the elements of the case. We have in it the revelation of a triumphant power participating in our sense of human helplessness. The eternal

[1] "Hutton's Essays," vol. i. pp. 422-3. [2] "Essays," vol. i. p. 372.

Son subjected Himself to the conditions of created existence; and He by whose power all things are made became a human child, and grew up to manhood, subject to all the laws of pure human growth and development. All the privations of poverty-stricken life, and all the sinless infirmities of man's lot, belonged to Him. Almighty power, blended with human weakness and strength held in reserve, were manifested all through His life. At this point Mr Hutton stops short in his account of the mission of the Mediator; but while holding all this very passionately, Calvinism goes on to a wider statement. Christ participated in our sense of human helplessness; but on Him, the only healthy member of the human race, were gathered all the sin and guilt and misery of the whole family. He lay under the accumulated woe of the whole world; and as the social head of the whole family in heaven and on earth who are named by His name, He bore their sins and carried their sorrows. In His sufferings and death He was vindicating the justice of God, and revealing the great law of the social unity of mankind; and the charge of artificiality drops out as soon as the great thought that Christ suffered representatively, as the Head of the Church, is fully grasped. One side of the "double dramatic fiction" grows intensely real. But this is "an opinion that rigorous spiritual justice concerns the external *act* of punishment, irrespective of the recipient." Nay, the substitution of Christ for man would be open to that charge, if He stood altogether unconnected with the human family, or had no more vital relation to them than the lambs and goats of the old economy had. The recipient of the punishment was the whole world, who laid their sins on the Lamb of God; and the stroke of justice fell on Him, as having in Himself all the persons and families of redeemed humanity. But the sufferings were the individual sufferings of a single person, and therefore no person other than the man Christ Jesus can realise them as His own, and therefore they are irrespective of the recipient; is once more the argument of Mr Hutton, in a formulated shape. He charges the doctrine of Substitution with professing "to excuse men once for all from all the requisitions of Divine law, on grounds wholly disconnected with their own spiritual life;" and further describes it as the mere "production of a proxy, in the most personal relations of

spiritual life." The doctrine of the organic unity of Christ and His people sets aside altogether the charge of artificiality brought against justification by faith, on its divine side. Is it fairly open to the charge of artificiality on its human side? It is rather sad work to have to state over again the old Reformation doctrine of Justification. How does man become a member of Christ? By one supreme act of living personal faith in a living Christ, a sinner becomes united to Christ. Calvinism teaches that by the power of a supernatural Agent, the soul of man is led through a course of purifying experience till it reaches the turning point at which its unwillingness breaks down, and it freely, joyously enters into the new relation of peace with God and love to Him, rendered possible by the Lord Jesus, and actual by the Holy Ghost. "Wholly disconnected with their spiritual life," precisely as the actual life of the growing oak is "wholly disconnected with" the potential life that lay slumbering in the acorn. It is only when, by a living faith, a man becomes united to Christ, that spiritual life can properly be said to begin. Grace, working in the heart and on the will of man, grows so powerful, that a historical time arises when the whole energies of a man are roused to an act of living trust, and then, but not till then, there is a new creature added to God's new creation. The union to Christ, virtually existent before all time, realises itself as an historical fact, in the consciousness of a man so united, and also as a fact well-dated in the providential government of the world. Even on the shewing of Mr Hutton, there is a time when penitence enters the heart, and a living trust in Christ arises and becomes the only pure fountain of action. And of course it follows, on the same ground, that there *was* a time when the heart was impenitent, and pure action and holiness unstained by human pride and unparalysed by human weakness, was impossible. To bridge the wide gulf between these two eras, there must be the interposition of a higher power, and the revelation of a better hope. To the Calvinist, the higher power is the Holy Spirit, working in some inscrutable way faith in man, giving new energy to his will, thereby uniting him to Christ by a living personal trust in a living personal Redeemer. Too much stress cannot be laid on the ethical relations of the atonement on its divine side, as antecedent to time; and, on its human

side, as realising itself to men, and as becoming in history a fact of human experience. But the ethical relations themselves have a formal aspect, and logically and necessarily lead to a formal statement of their ultimate grounds. While the doctrine against which Mr Hutton contends lays as much stress, nay, more stress than he does, on union to Christ by faith, as a fact in human experience, and also on human growth and development in spiritual life, it insists very strongly on the truth that the relation of the Divine Being to sin and disorder is a relation so full of hatred and aversion, that He should cease to be the pure holy being we believe Him to be, were He not to vindicate His own law against all who have disobeyed it. Any theory of the atonement that neglects its judicial side, will find itself unconsciously, but by necessity, engaged in lowering the idea of moral law and of the Divine purity, and also engaged in the sad work of evacuating the conception of sin of all its ethical contents. Without taking into account the judicial aspect of the atonement, its ethical relations cannot receive an adequate exposition; and without deepening in the human heart and conscience a sense of sin, as guilt and also as helplessness, the value of the Redeemer's work, as of One who wrought deliverance for man, and gives to man help and power, cannot be rightly estimated. In his zeal on behalf of the moral power of the atonement, Mr Hutton altogether loses sight of the other element essential to its true conception, and in his haste, he charges those who hold what he holds, in logical completeness with a wider view of truth, with holding the atonement to be merely legal, technical, and judicial. It is surely unnecessary for us to repudiate that definition of faith which makes it "a confidence, in the terms of a technical agreement, in which Christ and man are the contracting parties." Our faith is a confidence, not in an agreement, but in a Person. There is unquestionably an agreement between Christ and His people; but the agreement arises out of, and is a statement of, a union already accomplished, and is not itself the ground of that union. The central point of Calvinism is the Mediator —all its doctrines arise out of and terminate in Him, and are, in fact, but the expression of the relations in which He stands as Mediator to God and man.

It is a matter of some amazement to us, how the Broad

Church continue to hold so much of positive Christian truth as they do hold. They seem never to feel the lack of logical completeness, the want of consistency, and the undeveloped contradictions which are apparent to others in their teaching. With all their cry about science, there is an utter want of science in their method, and an utter want of coherence in their results. They are English in their theology, and it bears the mark of hasty thought, driven to fast conclusions by the force of urgent practical need. Each question is looked at as it arises, not in the light of general principles, but merely in itself; and a solution is arrived at, sufficient for the time. The number of settled questions grows upon their hands; but it never seems to strike them, that it is necessary to co-ordinate their ideas, and by the power of definite first principles to give form, unity, and consistency to their doctrines. Modern English Theology is too much like English law, a system marvellous in its dogmatism, in its defects, and in its inconsistencies. Surely, in theology at least, it is time to give up this mere hand-to-mouth method, and conduct their inquiries and arrive at their conclusions on other grounds than the impulse of the moment, and for higher reasons than the predilections of accidental caprice. Surely there is such a thing as theological method, and may be such a thing as theological certainty.

We come to the results which, according to Mr Hutton, are fairly chargeable to this theory. The first is the "chronic suspiciousness of nature without open war with it;" then that "askance glance at the joys of life, without either hearty acceptance, or manly resignation of them"—that way of "living half to the carnal and half to the spiritual man," &c. We cannot sufficiently admire, nor prove grateful enough to Mr Hutton, for the happy way in which he has seized and crystallized for us the vague objections which were floating up and down the great sea of modern literature. He has condensed into three or four sentences the gist of Mr Buckle's second volume, referring particularly to the history of civilization in Scotland. And he has exhausted the whole stock-in-trade of many a poor litterateur. Having got these so-called natural fruits of Calvinism, let us look at them, to see if they can veritably claim to belong to us. "A chronic suspiciousness of nature without open war with it." Now, if nature in this sentence mean the external universe, we must most courteously

refuse to admit the truth of the accusation. It would not be fair to deny that there is good historical ground for the charge brought against what must be admitted to be an essential feature of Calvinism. But even then, only one member of the sentence holds true. The Puritans of England and the Calvinists of Scotland, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were not suspicious of nature, but they did declare open war with it. They heaped epithets upon it, which we shall not transcribe at present. They regarded it as something not only unlovely, but dangerous; or if to their untaught eyes loveliness and beauty did occasionally appear, it was only all the more dangerous. But in feeling and acting thus, they simply shared the spirit that had possession of the age, in which all shared alike. Nor was this open war with nature a necessary result of their system. The simple love of nature, as shewn in the life and poetry of Wordsworth and others, which is becoming more and more general in modern times, existed in no heart in those ages. A thousand things which we see and delight in were to our ancestors either invisible or an object of horror and aversion. The old Hebrew way of looking upon nature as a display of Divine glory or a manifestation of Divine wrath, had died out, and the modern feeling had not yet arisen. If on historical grounds it is attempted to make out this charge, we submit that it would be as reasonable to charge calvinistic theology with fostering or bringing forth the belief in witchcraft, and all the horrors connected therewith. If on grounds of reason, then it may be well to shew that chronic suspiciousness of nature is not a necessary result of Calvinism. A practical proof would be to point to the written works of living Calvinists, in which a love of nature, passionate and pure as that which filled the heart of Wordsworth, glad and buoyant as that of Ruskin in his early works, is united to an intense faith in all the leading features of calvinistic theology. We might point to books published within the last few years, which manifest on every page a glad sympathy and honest delight in all the forms of external nature, and at the same time find in the processes and results of nature, illustrations and adumbrations of the truths of which we have already spoken. But we prefer another mode of argument.

We go back to Scripture, on which alone the doctrines of Calvinism are founded. We ask, what reference is made in

Revelation to the external world, not of men, but of nature? Is there not in historical narrative, in rhythmic song, in sublime prophecy, a constant reference to the external world, as revealing to men the power, wisdom, and goodness of God? Out of Scripture a quiet hand points ever at the glory of creation, and calls on man to behold everywhere traces of Divine wisdom, goodness, and love. The light is the garment of the Eternal. The darkness is His secret place. Dark waters and thick clouds of the skies are His pavilion. The thunder is His voice. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night revealeth knowledge. The year is crowned with His goodness. The little hills rejoice on every side. The mountains and the hills break forth into singing, and all the trees of the field do clap their hands. Whoso wishes to see and understand the true relation of men to nature, should read and ponder the 104th Psalm, in which the writer expatiates freely and joyously over all the kingdoms of creation—a poem, let us say, unsurpassed for lyric grace, beauty, and fire, by any composition in the world's history. Where in so short a space shall we find a wealth of description so lavish, a felicity of diction so marvellous, a range so extended, and a power so free from all strain, as in this marvellous poem? From the foundations of the earth, the rocky skeleton, upwards, through the movements of the rain clouds above and the river courses below, the growing of grass upon the fields, the clothing of the naked earth with the glory of flowers and the foliage of trees, the peopling of the solitude with innumerable races of living things, from the smallest to the greatest, the sea with its wealth of teeming life, and lastly, man described in one short sentence, "Man goeth forth to his work and his labour until the evening"—these all are clearly and beautifully alluded to in this short psalm. Nor is this singular in the books of the Bible. They are so full of allusion to natural sights and sounds, that were a man to have his thoughts full of these allusions, no object he sees, no sound he hears, but brings back to his memory some scriptural description, scene, or story.

But further, not only does Scripture continually dwell on creation, as illustrating the glory of the Creator; natural objects are linked by bonds of inseparable association with the leading facts of redemption. The voice of Him who spake as

never man spake, once said, "Consider the lilies of the field. . . . Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Behold the fowls of the air,"—and by so speaking referred all men to the visible creation, as a continued manifestation of the Divine glory. Has not earth grown sacred to every Christian man from the fact that the Son of man once dwelt thereon? Should not every hill and mountain recall to mind the hills of Galilee, on whose slopes the Redeemer walked so often, and specially that transfiguration mount, where, underneath the overshadowing cloud, the native glory of Christ flashed upon the eyes of the amazed disciples? Has not the sound of rushing winds and the vision of troubled waters received a new significance ever since, in the midnight hour, He walked upon the stormy waves, and commanded the troubled elements to sink into repose? Who can lie on the green grass without thinking of those thousands, wearied with their three days' sojourn in the wilderness, who were refreshed and strengthened by His love and care? And if any Christian man should still hesitate to yield himself trustfully and lovingly to the influences that come to him through external nature, let him bethink himself of the scenes and descriptions which John saw in apocalyptic vision; of the crystal and stable sea on which the glorified walk; and of the New Jerusalem, with gates of pearl and streets of gold; and let him say whether that which shall heighten the joys of immortality can be unlawful or dangerous in this present state. So far then is it from being true that Calvinism breeds chronic suspiciousness of nature—that a Calvinist, of all men, is bound on his own principles, lovingly and sympathetically, to study and search into nature in all her varying moods. To him every law of nature is a fixed thought of God; every beautiful and glorious scene the waving of His garments; every sublime and awful prospect but a revelation of His name and nature. But this is to view nature as having no self-existence, no radiance, no glory in herself, nothing but a divine language in which divine thoughts are written down. In reply, we ask, is it possible for any one to rejoice in nature without consciously or unconsciously postulating a personality either beyond her or within her? The assurance of immortality has rendered it for ever impossible for a human heart to rest finally in a simple love of nature. A pensive sadness

lingers through all our joy; and a consciousness of decay rises to interrupt the trustful feelings with which we resign ourselves to her influence. Learn to look on her as penetrated through and through with the Divine presence, as revealing in every nook and corner One unseen but ever near, and we grow to trust nature more deeply; for though the outward vesture of the eternal thought may vanish away, the thought once mastered remains an eternal possession of the soul. It seems possible to give such an interpretation to all the higher poetry of Wordsworth, as will render it consistent with the view of nature, characterised lately as the Hebrew. At all events, whether nature was to Wordsworth a personified ideal, or a revelation of a greater personality beyond, and manifesting itself through nature, it is open to us to read with joy the old meaning into the following passage:

> "I have felt
> A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man,—
> A motion and a spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things."

Let us look next at the second result which, according to Mr Hutton, fairly and naturally flows from Calvinism: "That askance glance at the joys of life without either hearty acceptance or manly resignation of them." The joys of life is a wide and vague expression, and is open to the objection that it binds into one indiscriminate whole all joys whatsoever. There are joys which arise and terminate within man's animal nature, as there are joys which can only be felt by a man of culture and of refinement. There is the feverish joy of the banqueting-hall, and the demoralising gladness of the gin-palace; there is the rapturous ecstacy of a Swinburnian hero, in scenes which cannot be more plainly alluded to here; there is the gloating rapture of the miser, and the reckless glee of those who have lost all self-respect,—surely to none of these has Mr Hutton alluded in the above extract. For to Mr Hutton, as to us, human culture and true human

development must be a culture within a certain range, and a development along a certain line. The struggle towards the attainment of true knowledge is a struggle, on the other hand, against the power of ignorance; and the culture of the higher powers and energies of the soul can only be obtained at the cost of repression to many tendencies of our nature. Every man must draw the line somewhere between joys which are in themselves undesirable and which in their results sear and scorch all that is praiseworthy in man's nature, and those other joys which refresh and strengthen and energise all the higher powers and sweeten the forthgoings of human activity.

> "Man, if he but live within the light
> Of high endeavour, daily spreads abroad
> His being, armed with strength which cannot fail."

The "light of high endeavour" can only shine on those who are earnestly striving after further knowledge, and who are struggling forward, in a stern battle with evil and ignorance and selfishness, towards the perfect symmetry of complete humanity. One of the most thoughtful writers of the present time, at the conclusion of one of her greatest works, thus sums up its teaching:

> "We can only have the highest happiness, such as goes along with being a great man, by having wide thoughts and much feeling for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves; and this sort of happiness often brings so much pain with it, that we can only tell it from pain by its being what we would choose before everything else, because our souls see it is good."

The accusation brought against our doctrine can only be made good, we see, by raising all human joys to the same level, for as soon as a distinction is drawn between joys, the same "askance" glance may be seen to arise. It can be brought as strongly against the theory of the last quotation as against the theory of Calvinism; nay, it may be brought much more strongly to bear upon Mr Hutton's own theory than upon either. Is he not, in all his essays, casting an askance glance at various forms of life and thought, and doing his utmost to extinguish them as neither good in themselves nor desirable for men? If he makes any distinction between joy and joy, at once his charge falls to the ground; and there can be no surer ground of discrimination between healthy and

unhealthy joy, than the old calvinistic distinction between sinful joys and those which are innocent. Calvinism has no controversy with human joys as such, nor does it cast an askance glance and a longing eye on human pleasure. It simply asks, whether there be in the enjoyment of these anything sinful or inconsistent with the new relation in which man is placed to God and man; and if the gratification of any feeling be seen to be sinful in itself, or ruinous to higher and better states of soul and heart, then manfully to resign these is the clear command of Calvinism. Opposed in all respects is Calvinism to the modern theory of culture. Sin can never be culture—can never issue in a harmonious development of man's many-sided nature. The radical mistake of the modern theory is, that it assumes man to stand related to all things, good or evil, sinful or holy, in precisely the same way, and takes for granted that every human experience must issue in a nobler, wider, higher life. Now, Calvinism holds that sin in all its forms has not a formative, but a deformative, influence on human life, and that "sweetness and light" can only truly come when it actually grows out of a life resting on the stable foundation of allegiance to the everlasting laws of true thinking and right living. It takes hold with a firm loving grasp of all the joys that spring out of true life, and issue in a widening of all the possibilities of existence; for it holds that a healthy joy broadens the horizon, and cherishes a grace and a calmness, a peace and a love, which form the crown of humanity. But the unhealthy joy, which feeds on ashes and thrives on corruption, which seals the higher powers in unending slumber, which springs from decay and ends in death, call this joy by any name you please, dignify it by the name of culture, ennoble it by all the grace of art and all the charm of poetry, against it in all its forms Calvinism swears an eternal enmity, and shall wage with it an everlasting war. Calvinism looks askance, not on the joys of life, but on the joys of death. Her aim is always to hallow every common duty, and to introduce the joyous sacredness of man's highest and purest motives into every relation of life. In Calvinism there is no fixed line of demarcation between things sacred and things secular; no high sacredness attached to places, times, or ceremonies, which, by consequence, renders all other places, times, and circumstances, not sacred; but every department of human

activity, and every sphere of human thought and work, is held sacred and honourable. The claims on man which Calvinism puts forth are by no means humble or modest. It insists on accompanying the author to his desk, the statesman to his place in the senate, the merchant to his office; it will accompany men to the farm, to the workshop, and the mine; and it demands that men carry with them a sense of the sacredness of all true work, and that all true work, however common and trivial, should be a tribute of praise to God. What can we say more but simply add the sacred words, "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God?"

Short work may be made of the other two results which, according to Mr Hutton, naturally flow from a theory of imputed righteousness. These two are truly one. They amount to a charge of double-mindedness as a necessary result of Calvinism. We have been accustomed to consider and to mourn over this tendency to mere officialism as a weakness to which all men are equally liable. It certainly is a tendency from which no man has been altogether free. For the last quarter of a century, without any reference to any particular ism, Mr Carlyle has been hurling the charge of artificiality against mankind in general, and has been preaching with all his power the gospel of simple earnestness and awful sincerity. Ere Calvinism was heard of—nay, ere Christianity itself was known—poets and moralists waxed eloquent in denunciation of the inconsistency between profession and practice. But this tendency that seems to be a constant feature of human life, is to be brought out anew and made to do service against Calvinism, as if it were a new evil inflicted by a monstrous system on a much-suffering world. Is it not recognised as a truism by all thoughtful writers of history, that there is a tendency in every religious system to resolve itself into a mere tradition in which the husk is sacredly preserved, while the living faith once enshrined therein drops out and is forgotten? The faith of one generation is very apt to become the mere formula of the next. And every new generation must translate for itself the everlasting truths of revelation into its own fitting forms of speech and action. Vital truth for any man is that which corresponds to the deepest needs of his nature, and which he can grasp with all the power of his

intellect, and apprehend with all the faith of his spiritual being. Yet correspondence to his needs and his own power of faith cannot be for any man the true measure of truth and righteousness. At this point emerges all the narrowness of the self-styled broad school of theology. The truth which they have found living, and the relation in which truth was manifested to them, become for them truth for all, and the only relation in which it may be apprehended by men. On their own principles, ere they can denounce any system, it must be shewn by them as not livingly apprehended by any living man—as not truly that by which his faith is informed and his life guided. For what feeds and cherishes true spiritual life in any human soul, must have in it some truth and some power, however great may be the error and superstition therewith connected. And Mr Hutton is false to his own principles when he treats this matter as he has done. If ever the teaching of Mr Hutton should become traditional, and be extensively held by any number of people, it will be singular indeed if his teaching alone should escape the fate of all religious teaching. The phrases he writes with such passionate conviction will come forth with a hollow ring from the lips of those who have never made them their own. Already there are signs of hollowness and decay in the writings of the disciples of his theological master, Mr Maurice; and the further these convictions of Mr Maurice were from the creed of evangelical Christendom, the more hollow they sound on other lips than his. Hollowness and insincerity may accompany any form of creed whatsoever; and the greater the number of those who profess a creed, the greater will be the number of those who say one thing and think another, and who make a profession of belief without a corresponding adequate conviction.

An old Hebrew psalmist, in an inspired moment, once wrote these words, as his deepest wish and most earnest prayer: "Unite my heart to fear Thy name." The Master, in the Sermon on the Mount, with solemn reiteration, called on men to be earnest and sincere, and warned them against leading a double life. A servant of Christ also wrote that "a double-minded man is unstable in all his ways;" and in many other places of Holy Writ, men are warned against the tendency to face both ways, against striving to serve God and mammon,

as a practice into which they were constantly liable to fall. We accordingly offer to Mr Hutton the following dilemma: "If the tendency to an official life with the Redeemer and actual life with the world" be a result due to Calvinism, and to Calvinism only, then Calvinism must have been the creed of all those writings of Scripture, wherein prayers for sincerity and warnings against officialism are recorded, in which case the opinion that Calvinism alone is truly scriptural must be held proven. If the same tendency be a constant feature of human nature, and equally attaching itself to every form of belief, then as a specific charge against Calvinism it must fall to the ground.

But enough of this. Yet we cannot take leave of Mr Hutton without expressing our thankfulness to him for the contribution he has made to modern theological literature, and also for the attempt he has made to bridge the gulf—alas! too wide—that separates theology from literature. Time was when all literature was theological; now theology is a thing apart, and too few are they who give any thought or time to its development.

We had hoped to be able to place other doctrines distinctively calvinistic alongside of the prevailing tendencies of modern literature and life. We have assumed throughout, on the part of our readers, a knowledge of the distinctive features of our system, which we are afraid is not possessed by many alluded to here. It is impossible within our limits not to make such an assumption. But should any one wish to see the latest results of calvinistic thought, by one whom all Calvinists regard as their representative theologian and greatest thinker, we refer them to the great work of Dr Hodge, of America. In his "Systematic Theology," will be found the whole system of calvinistic theology, placed in relation to all the results of modern science, philosophy, and literature; there will be found adequate knowledge of all that has been accomplished by modern thought, combined with a firm conviction that Calvinism is the true theology. Since the publication of Dr Hodge's work, the charge of ignorance of the spirit and results of science, so commonly brought against calvinistic theologians, must receive its *quietus*. The processes and results of German thought in philosophy and theology, the speculations of English writers regarding the external universe,

the reasonings and conclusions of Huxley and Darwin in the domain of science, are all grasped in a comprehensive spirit, fairly stated, and when needful, controverted on grounds both of reason and revelation. Theologians must admire his thorough knowledge of the history of theology; philosophers will concede that philosophy has but few phases not recognised and appreciated by him; while men of science must confess that both the philosophy of the inductive sciences, and their incalculable results, are matters of familiar knowledge to this greatest of modern English-speaking theologians. Specially would we recommend this work to our English theologians of the broad school. A study of Dr Hodge will enable them to give to their system the backbone of thought and fact, which at present is painfully awanting. Those who disagree most with his conclusions, will recognise in his book the existence of Calvinism as a living fact; and will, we trust, bestow on its doctrines an investigation, conducted on higher principles and informed by better methods than the mere unreasoning prejudice to which we have lately been accustomed.

JAMES IVERACH.

---

## ART. III.—*The Anglo-Catholic Movement.*

THE Prime Minister has described, in his "Chapter of Autobiography," the enthusiasm with which, in his youth, he regarded the prospects of the Church of England under "the great renovating movement, which largely centered in Oxford." Now that forty years have passed since the Oxford Tractarianism arose, it may be well to survey the development of what has certainly formed, whether we call it a blessed revival or a grievous apostacy, one of the most momentous religious phenomena of our time. Its history has yet to be written; but the main facts of its rise and progress are easily obtained from such works as Newman's "History of my Religious Opinions," "Froude's Remains," the "Life of F. W. Faber," "Browne's Annals," and the controversial writings of Pusey, Oakley, Littledale, and Orby Shipley. It is less easy to estimate correctly the strength which this movement has acquired, and to forecast its future.

Every one knows that the first leaders of the Oxford party were John Keble, John Henry Newman, and E. B. Pusey. Others played a part, but these were "the three mighties." Keble, by the firmness of his reactionary opinions, combined with his pensive devoutness and his "odour of sanctity," exercised a profound influence on minds keener and more aggressive than his own. All who were associated with him pay great homage to his name. Mr Gladstone calls him "a true saint, if this generation has seen one;" and Dr Newman actually dates the Oxford movement from the publication, in the year 1833, of a sermon by Keble, entitled "National Apostacy." Newman himself was the genius of the new party, and brought to its service immense intellectual vigour and dialectic skill. Pusey had learning, astuteness, and that faculty of perseverance which can bear any amount of buffeting, and push on to its conclusions. Undeniably these—the "first three" captains of the host—were all high-toned men, blameless in life, devout in temperament, and full of earnest purpose. They had little affinity with the popular mind, and therefore could not move the multitude; but they were the very men to influence the younger members of a University, and seem to have cast a sort of spell over their associates.

The leaders and members of the party have been compared to the band of Oxford Methodists in the last century; and there are points of superficial resemblance. But the difference is immense. The Oxford students, called Methodists, tended at first to an ascetic piety; but, so soon as they learned the way of grace more perfectly, they devoted themselves to the preaching of the gospel, and to the promotion of vital godliness through faith in Christ. But the Oxford students, who were called Tractarians, dissatisfied with the religious and moral condition of their country, sought the remedy in raising the authority of the Church, and of a Christian priesthood. Both of these Oxford movements have issued in great revivals, but on different principles and in different directions; having indeed nothing in common, except the circumstance, that they originated alike among earnest and devout members of the same University.

The young Tractarians of 1833 fastened their minds intently on the dogma of the continuous existence of the Church as a catholic and visible kingdom of Christ on earth, and endeavoured

to vindicate the position and establish the authority of the Church of England, as an integral part of the one catholic church. Church authority was to them everything; and, as of necessity, they abhorred and denounced Protestantism, with its constant appeals to Scripture and its right of private judgment. One of the party (the Rev. W. Palmer, of Magdalen College), very early and very distinctly expressed this anti-Protestantism:

"I publicly profess myself a Catholic and a member of a Catholic Church, and say anathema to the principle of Protestantism (which I regard as identical with the principle of Dissent), and to all its forms, sects, and denominations, especially to those of the Lutherans and Calvinists, and British and American Dissenters. Likewise to all persons who knowingly and willingly, and understanding what they do, shall assert either for themselves or for the Church of England, the principle of Protestantism, or maintain the Church of England to have one and the same common religion, with any or all of the various forms and sects of Protestantism, or shall communicate themselves in the temples of Protestants, or give communion to the members, or go about to establish any intercommunion between our church and theirs, otherwise than by bringing them in the first instance to renounce their errors and promise a true obedience for the future to the entire faith and discipline of the Catholic and Apostolic Episcopate—to all such I say anathema."[1]

Animated by such sentiments, the Tractarians of forty years ago, sometimes nicknamed Puseyites, defined it as their aim to deliver their church from the disgrace and disfigurement of Protestantism, and to catholicise England by inculcating the authority of Tradition, the Apostolic Succession, and the Sacramental Theology.

They were called Tractarians, because of the important part which tracts played at first in their "propaganda." The first three numbers of the "Tracts for the Times," were published simultaneously on the 9th September 1833; the subjects being (1.) The Ministerial Commission; (2.) The Catholic Church; (3.) The Alteration of the Liturgy. The series proceeded without causing much alarm, till Tract XC appeared from the subtle pen of Newman, and shocked the public mind by its advocacy of non-natural or evasive interpretation. Previous tracts dealt with church principles, and what is called the catholic sense of the Book of Common Prayer. But Tract XC took up the Thirty-nine Articles, and endeavoured to shew

[1] Letter to Rev. C. P. Golightly, quoted in "Browne's Annals," p. 46.

that these, although "the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine." The writer, being an anti-Protestant and an Arminian, laboured to justify his subscription to articles of religion which have commonly been considered Protestant and Calvinistic; and while we are far from ascribing to Dr Newman any intentional duplicity, we must say that Tract XC was a wonderful specimen of sophistication. Thus, when the twenty-second Article is reached, which condemns "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints," it is first remarked, that there is an ancient catholic doctrine of these things, which preceded the Romish, and is not condemned; then it is maintained that what the Article repudiates cannot be the Tridentine statement on the points mentioned, because the Articles were drawn up before the Council of Trent promulgated its decrees; and therefore concludes that the twenty-second Article is levelled only against some extreme opinions taught in the Roman schools of the day. A minor example of the same style of interpretation may be quoted from the discussion of the thirty-second Article. It being there affirmed that "it is lawful for bishops, priests, and deacons, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion," the writer of Tract XC draws from this language the amazing inference, that "our Church has power, did she so choose, to take from them this discretion."

The publication of this famous tract produced one of those explosions in which the Protestant feeling of England is wont to relieve itself, and then unfortunately to fall asleep. Bishops lamented after their fashion. The Bishop of Oxford went further, and required that the Tracts for the Times should be discontinued. The Hebdomadal Board of the University openly condemned Tract XC, as "evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors, which they were designed to counteract." In the year 1843, the Vice-Chancellor's Court actually suspended the Professor of Hebrew (Dr Pusey), on account of a sermon preached by him on "The Holy Eucharist." But the storm of indignation blew itself out, and the Tractarian movement spread. And why?

Just because, though it was embarrassed by the Articles, it had no such difficulty with the Liturgy.

"As to the sacraments and sacramental rites (says Dr Newman), I stood on the Prayer-Book. I appealed to the Ordination Service, in which the bishop says, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost;' to the Visitation Service, which teaches Confession and Absolution; to the Baptismal Service, in which the priest speaks of the child after baptism as Regenerate; to the Catechism, in which Sacramental Communion is 'receiving verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ;' to the Commination Service, in which we are told to 'do works of penance;' to the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels; to the Calendar and Rubrics, portions of the Prayer-Book wherein we find the festivals of the apostles, notices of certain other saints, and days of fasting and abstinence."[1]

In fact, the tables now were turned. If the Tractarians were obliged to put a non-natural sense on the Articles, they could appeal to the natural sense of some of the most important parts of the Prayer-Book, and leave evasive interpretation to their opponents. They revived the teaching of Archbishop Laud, Bishop Cosin, and the other High Church divines of the seventeenth century, and soon surpassed their teachers.

Ashamed of the Reformation, and bent on the restoration of pre-Reformation doctrines and usages, the Tractarians could not but arrive at the borders of Romanism. It was with difficulty that they refrained from crossing the line. In the year 1840, Newman wrestled with the difficulty; and it is curious to read his own account of the manner in which he reconciled his conscience to remain in the Church of England:

"I do not think that we have yet made fair trial how much the English Church will bear. I know it is a hazardous experiment, like proving cannon; yet we must not take it for granted that the metal will burst in the operation. It has borne at various times, not to say at this time, a great infusion of catholic truth without damage. As to the result—viz., whether the process will not approximate the whole English Church as a body to Rome—that is nothing to us. For what we know, it may be the providential means of uniting the whole Church in one, without fresh schismatising or use of private judgment. Say, that I move sympathies for Rome; in the same sense do Hooker, Taylor, Bull, &c. Their arguments may be against Rome, but their sympathies must be towards Rome, so far as Rome maintains truths which our Church does not teach or enforce. I am doing just the very thing which all our doctors have ever been doing."[2]

---

[1] "History of my Religious Opinions." [2] Ibid., p. 136.

Keble resisted to his death the idea of submitting to Rome. Pusey has adhered to the same course. In his "Eirenicon," he dwells "with pleasure on the amount of faith which we confess in common with the Roman Church. We use the self-same prayer in baptism, and thank God in the same words that He has been pleased to regenerate our children therein. After confession, the Church directs the self-same words to be used in absolving from sin. I believe that we have the same doctrine of grace and of justification. There is not one statement in the elaborate chapter on justification in the Council of Trent which any of us could fail of receiving." What Dr Pusey demurs to is the doctrine of "the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, as held in the Roman Church to be co-extensive with the intercession of our Lord, and to be the access to His." But the third great leader of the Oxford movement could not be at rest; and in the year 1845, John Henry Newman was received into the Church of Rome. F. W. Faber and Oakley were received in the same year, with many of smaller note. A few years later, the Gorham decision, which protected the evangelical clergy, increased the secession to Rome. Archdeacon Manning went over in the year 1851, and was soon followed by two of the Wilberforces. The secession, including as it did many of the laity in high social position, as well as about two hundred of the clergy, undoubtedly checked Tractarianism. Some of its leading spirits were now lost to it; and new adherents drew back in alarm when they saw that the path on which they had entered was so likely to end at the feet of the Pope.

But the convictions instilled by the "Tracts for the Times" were too widely spread and too enthusiastically held to perish under a little discouragement. The Anglo-Catholic movement, never quite brought to a pause, recovered strength, and began to shew itself in new directions. It lost prestige at Oxford, where a rationalistic fashion of thought succeeded, as might have been expected, to the extravagance of sacerdotalism, and brought such men as Baden Powell and Jowett into favour. But at this period we begin to hear of the introduction of a high ceremonial, not without resistance, into churches of the metropolis,—the intoning of prayers, the bedecking of altars, the placing of crosses and lights upon them, and chancel services. That which had been a didactic movement,

issuing from a university, became a movement for the restoration of what is called "Catholic worship." So it changed its seat from Oxford to London, took possession of churches and chapels, and called itself the Catholic Revival. In a word Tractarianism passed into Ritualism. Allying itself with the love of music, decoration, and architecture, which belongs to a rich, luxurious age, and accommodating itself to the craving of the human mind for objective helps in divine service, mechanical devotion, and the protection of holy places and of mystic charms, it had great elements of success. On minds slow to apprehend the teaching of sermons and tracts, it soon began to impress its tenets of sacerdotal prerogative and sacramental grace through the ritual and ceremonial, which have been called "the hieroglyphics of the Catholic religion." As both Dr Pusey and Archdeacon Denison have told us, the tactics were changed on the principle:

> "Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem,
> Quam quae sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus."

In the more popular form which it has assumed during the last twenty years, the Anglo-Catholic movement has been conducted with great boldness, and with very considerable skill. The leaders have shewn that they perfectly understand what to attempt, and in what order to advance. Their policy is more definite, and their action more combined and resolute, than those of any other party in the Church of England.

It must be confessed that the constitution of that Church affords them every facility. There is no effective ecclesiastical discipline, no self-purifying power, and no combined or central judgment. Individual bishops have lamented, expostulated, and exhorted; but they are flouted with impunity by the Ritualistic clergy and the press which they inspire. Attempts have been made to repress the dogmas and practices of the rising party by processes of law; but the result of such efforts on the basis of the present ambiguous Church formularies, has only been to make room for every one, till, as the *Times* has said, "It is now established that a clergyman of the Church of England may teach any doctrines within limits which only extreme subtlety can distinguish from Roman Catholicism on the one side, from Calvinism on another side, and from Deism on a third." This result, too, seems to give immense satisfaction in high political and literary circles. It accords with the

latitudinarian theory now in vogue, that a national Church ought to comprise all schools of religious thought, provided always, however, that prelates be acknowledged and the Prayer-Book read. The theory is as broad as possible for prelatists, but as narrow as possible when the case of non-prelatists is considered. No heresy is to exclude the former from a national Church; but no orthodoxy or usefulness can admit the latter within it. Such is the boasted spirit of comprehension which still flings the Act of Uniformity in the face of millions of the best people in England, and refuses to them the permission to bury their dead with their own rites in the national burial grounds; while it makes room in national churches for anything that prelatists choose to introduce, and has allowed the Ritualistic clergy to multiply with impunity till they can now defy all the Protestantism that remains in the Establishment to cast them out.

Unquestionably the High Church party predominates in numbers, and still more in importance, among the clergy; and of that party the Ritualists, who support the Church Union, and form the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament," are only the more eager spirits and active pioneers. The most influential divine in the whole Church is probably Dr Pusey; the most admired preacher is Canon Liddon; the maker of bishops is Mr Gladstone. No wonder that the High Churchmen are emboldened, or that their advanced guard, the Ritualists, are pressing their advantage against a bewildered and disorganised, and therefore ineffectual, opposition. Openly they scoff at Protestantism and Evangelicalism. The former is a mere element of revolution, which has spent its strength. Mr Baring Gould coolly assures us that "Protestantism, having no logical position, must disappear. There can be only Catholic Christianity and Rationalism." "The Reformation materially affected the English Church, as an attack of typhus fever is injurious to the constitution of a patient. By the providence of God, the healthy constitution of the Church will enable it to throw off the disease, and restore it to the vigour of unimpaired vitality."[1] What has been called Evangelicalism, according to Toplady, Romaine, Cecil, and Venn, is also described as the creed of an effete party in the Church, and of schismatical Dissenters outside.

[1] "The Church and the World" (1868), pp. 237, 244.

No doubt, there may be in this language a good deal of "bounce," and it is certain that wherever the gospel is preached with simplicity and power, the English people flock to it and relish it as much as ever they did. But it is, at the same time, certain that Evangelical zeal is only one form of zeal in the Church of England, and we fear that it is not the most conspicuous form. The activity of the Ritualists is noticed in all directions, and is making a real impression on the country.

It is held by some, that the movement of which we treat is almost confined to the clergy, and that the laity are quite uncorrupted, and soundly Protestant. This may have been true ten years ago, but it is not so accurate to-day. As to the clergy, indeed, their case is much the worst. One of themselves, a "High Churchman of the old school," recoiling from the Dis-reformers, has lately written these melancholy words:

"I confess I do not see much reason for hope among the clergy. It is true that a very large proportion of the present clergy are untouched, and are, though passively perhaps, opposed to the innovations; but the elder generation seems paralysed and bewildered by mediævalistic audacity. Day by day these elder clergy are dying out, and their places are taken by men whose sympathies have been enlisted in favour of the sacerdotal school, by the influence of fascinating teachers, or by their natural readiness to accept systems which *ipso facto* give them that position and influence which is so tempting to all, but especially to young men. It is impossible not to be struck with the sacerdotal spirit which these young priestlings, from the moment they chip the egg, exhibit in their dress, their demeanour, their looks, their gait, their mode of performing the service, their sermons, their arguments, their views, their conversation: everything about them has a smack of their school."[1]

Unfortunately, the plague has begun to spread among the laity too. They are imbibing the most superstitious views of the sacraments, and crowding the churches where high ritual is observed. Of the 10,000 enrolled members of the English Church Union, a Ritualistic organisation, 7000 are laymen. It is alleged that a considerable number of young people are drawn from the ranks of Nonconformity to the Ritualistic congregations. Of this we have no proper evidence, and yet we partly believe it, there being no guarantee now-a-days that children will worship after the manner of their fathers, and the only question with many young and heedless persons being

[1] *Quousque?* London, 1873. P. 15.

as to the best music, and the "nicest service." Dr Littledale taunts the Evangelical clergy with their inability to attract Dissenters, and claims for his own party great success in that direction:

"It is not in the least worth a Dissenter's while to join the Evangelical party in the Church of England, because he can get, in his own sect, a better article of the same kind as they have to offer. But the Tractarian offers to unfold to the dissenting neophyte the august mysteries of a grand, loving, and harmonious creed; to give him that pardon he longs to hear, but which no minister of his own is empowered to speak; to feed him with the Bread of Angels, and to enshrine all this teaching in a stately Ritual, which is not, like that of the other school, his own with the chill on, but which suggests to him the blended visions of Sinai and of Patmos. Thus, large numbers of Dissenters yearly join the worship in Ritualistic churches, at first from curiosity, and eventually from conviction."[1]

These words are very bitter, but they are only specimens of the habitually contemptuous language in which the Ritualistic enthusiasts refer to the Low Churchmen of their own communion. It is answered by vigorous denunciation of these troublers of Israel as conspirators and apostates, who wish to substitute mediæval errors and unscriptural crotchets for the simple worship and scriptural teaching of a Reformed Church. The result is a vehement civil war within the Establishment—verging fast to a condition of downright anarchy, and open scandal in Christendom. The Church of England has immense mental vigour, social influence, and material resources at her command, and yet never did she present to other churches a more deplorable condition, prating against all of them as sects, while she is torn with the conflicts and jealousies of the sects within her own bosom, and is kept from falling to pieces only by a bond which an Act of Parliament can at any time unloose—the bond of State-Establishment. What a retribution is this on a church which thrust out her evangelical men in the seventeenth century for nonconformity, and her earnest spirits in the eighteenth century for their irregularity, to be now overrun with nonconformists and irregulars of the worst description—men who turn the church service into the closest possible imitation of Roman Catholic worship, and defy all the Bishops in England to restrain their course of procedure!

Those who assert that the laity are still untouched by

[1] "The Church and the World" (1868), p. 36.

Ritualism must mean the middle classes, and such of the working-class as care anything for Church questions—a very small proportion. In the upper classes, we find the more intellectual of both sexes usually sceptical, or attached to a very Broad Churchism; but, when those have been excepted, Evangelical Protestantism is almost without influence, High Churchism is in fashion, and Ritualism is fast becoming the rage. The poor are also being infected indirectly through the training of their children in the schools connected with Ritualistic churches, and directly through the visits of Anglican curates and of the members of brotherhoods and sisterhoods. Confession, which has for many years been strongly advocated by Dr Pusey, is now attended by numerous devotees of both sexes. Intoning of prayers, reverences to the altar, and the celebration of the blessed Eucharist as a high mystery, have become congenial to many persons of position; and the old style of English service, which sufficed twenty or thirty years ago, is denounced as bald, cold, and slovenly. Pictures are suspended over high altars; images are again set up; for the *Church Herald*[1] coolly informs us: "In England, religious statuary is being made use of very largely, the old and stupid Protestant prejudices having been greatly weakened through the tact, ability, and discretion of so many of our leading architects. Some of our restored cathedrals are now full of images." Nor should it be said that the Ritualistic laity are only fussy and frivolous persons, who like gaudy shows and entrancing music. There is a religiousness, after its kind, which grows under such a system, as indeed it grows under the services of the Church of Rome. Devotional manuals of a very intense, though at the same time very servile, order of piety, are largely circulated, and, we must suppose, read. "Missions," or revival services, are promoted. "Retreats," also, are being multiplied, to which persons retire for meditation and confession, and for courses of "exercises," which last are held to be "to the spiritual life what the Newtonian system is to the natural world!" Five years ago, the Rector of Clewer, Windsor, wrote as follows:

"The rapid growth of retreats during the last twelve years, is one of the cheering signs of the growth in the Church of England of spiritual

---

[1] 15th October last.

religion of the highest Catholic type. They are at present held every year at about eighteen or twenty places. [The number has increased considerably since the year 1868.] They have received the express sanction and support of certain of our bishops. . . . Not merely the clergy and religious communities now regularly hold their retreats, but laymen and men of business have had the same system arranged to meet their needs and opportunities."[1]

Thus are the minds of English men, women, and children being impregnated with superstition, and a complete machinery of spiritual direction is being established in the hands of priests. As things are now tending, we think Mr Orby Shipley need not despair of seeing his desire accomplished: an oratory in "the spiritual desert between Oxford Street and Piccadilly, with a staff of priests, and two, three, four, or more daily celebrations of Mass, one of which should be High Mass." He may have as many confessionals as he likes in the oratory, "with the days, hours, and priest's name in attendance, plainly painted on the outside," for such arrangements are already made openly in some of the district churches of London. He may even have what he calls "the great and inestimable blessing—the last great need which the revival still lacks—the Reserved presence on the high altar, with its ever-burning brazen lamp;"[2] for in several Ritualistic churches the consecrated bread is now reserved with prodigious ceremony, and a lamp kept burning to indicate the Divine presence.

The current accusation against the thing variously called Tractarianism, Puseyism, and Ritualism, is, that it is merely Popery in a thin disguise. The Anglo-Catholics are denounced as traitors to the true principles of the Church of England, and secret allies of the Church of Rome. Is this accusation perfectly just and fair? It assumes that the Church of England is distinctly opposed to the Church of Rome, and that its principles are unambiguously Protestant. But this is what the Ritualists deny; and, as it seems to an onlooker, with a good measure of reason. The Church of England did in the sixteenth century reject the Papal Supremacy, and replace it by the Royal Supremacy; but in little else did it clearly oppose itself to the Church of Rome. True enough that the first and

[1] "The Church and the World" (1868), p. 433.
[2] Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. Pamphlet, 1871.

second Prayer-Books of Edward VI., were conceived in the spirit of the Reformation, but the subsequent revisions under Elizabeth, James I., and Charles II., were all in the contrary direction; and as the Formularies were finally adjusted, they contain language worse than ambiguous in regard to the sacraments, confession, absolution, and the prerogatives of the clergy. Dr Newman could not be contradicted, when he wrote of these Formularies: "They were drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and we are using them for the purpose for which their authors framed them." In the year 1862, there was published in London an address to foreigners visiting England, to induce them to attend the services of the Established Church; and in this paper it was maintained, that "the events which took place at the beginning of the sixteenth century involved no schism, because the doctrine of Catholic times was preserved, and the continuity of the Apostolic Succession was carefully maintained." In proof of this, special attention was called to the following points, and we venture to say, that they demand the serious attention of Englishmen far more than of foreigners:

"1. The Church of England holds unreservedly one baptism for the remission of sins, and teaches the doctrine of Regeneration in and by Holy Baptism.

"2. The Church of England requires that all who have been baptised should be brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him, so soon as they can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue. She believes that by the laying on of the hands of the bishop in confirmation, the gift of the Holy Ghost is conferred.

"3. The Church of England, in common with all other portions of the Church Catholic, holds the real objective presence of our Lord's body and blood, under the form of bread and wine, and the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

"4. The Church of England holds the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession.

"5. The Church of England believes that every priest has the power committed to him of forgiving and retaining sins. And she invites all persons troubled in conscience, either in sickness or in preparation for the Holy Communion, to make a special confession of their sins to the parish priest, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, that they may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice."[1]

[1] Published in preface to Essays on "Reunion of Christendom," 1867. The statements made are supported by express references to the Prayer-Book offices and Catechism.

All that an Evangelical Episcopalian can say in reply is, that he does not so construe the language of the Prayer-Book, and that neither he nor his party hold the doctrines so affirmed. But what does this avail, when such construction is, in the judgment of unprejudiced observers, the most natural, and is admitted to be so by an increasing number of clergy and laity, who demand a revision of the Liturgy on the very ground that it gives countenance and shelter to the errors in question? What does it avail, when it is certain that the language relied on by the Ritualists, was admitted into the Prayer-Book, not through oversight, but with a view to conciliate and include men who held the five points stated above, and when all the world knows, that in the Church of England there has always been during the past three centuries, a High Church party, sometimes feeble, but at other times paramount, which has held that the Church is committed to the doctrines here specified, and is therefore in harmony with the Greek and Latin churches much more than with the Lutheran and Reformed Communions? In fact, so long as the Formularies remain as they are, the Ritualists are not open to the charge of treachery. They are not exponents of the views of such Reformers as Cranmer, Latimer, and Jewel, and do not pretend or desire to be; but in any argument founded on the interpretation of the Prayer-Book, they have a perfectly good standing in the Church, and are able to retort sharply on their opponents.

We are quite aware that this view is very unwelcome to many good people, who have always held and said that the Church of England is a reformed church, and the very bulwark of the Reformation. But no such fond assertions can alter historical fact. This Church was never thoroughly reformed according to the Word of God. It has been, and is, a masterpiece of compromise; but sooner or later compromise between truth and error must issue in bitter injury to the truth.

There are those who, believing the Church of England to be a Protestant institution, cannot account for the Anglo-Catholic movement, except by supposing a foreign element or *virus* of Romanism, secretly and cunningly introduced. They tell us that Jesuits, or other competent emissaries of the Holy See, must have taken orders in the Church of England with a view to pervert its members, and minimise the distinction between that Church and the Church of Rome. They point out the

fact, that while there has been a stream of accessions to the latter church from the Anglo-Catholic clergy and laity, a sufficient number have always been left behind to act as decoys to others, and to pursue in English churches that style of teaching and service which is fully developed in the Church of Rome. Especially since the avowed introduction of the confessional, prayers for the dead, celebration of mass, and the reservation of the blessed sacrament for adoration, the suspicion has been strong and wide-spread that there is a deliberate conspiracy to Romanise England again, and that the plot was hatched at the Propaganda or the Vatican.

Now, it has been shewn that confidential emissaries from Rome have at critical times conformed to the Church of England, under dispensation from the Pope, with a view to sow discord among Protestants, and suggest reconciliation to the Holy Father. And it is quite possible that such tactics have been repeated. A curious fact has been mentioned by Mr Oakley, in regard to Dr Charles Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, who died in 1829. Pusey, Newman, and most of the Tractarians, had been his pupils. Mr Oakley says:

"I have no doubt whatever that his teaching had a most important influence upon the movement in its ultimate and, as I may call it, Roman stage. The *fact was, that Dr Lloyd had enjoyed in his youth many opportunities of intercourse with the French emigrant clergy, to whom he was indebted, as he told us, for truer views of the Catholic religion than were generally current in this country. But his contributions to our future conclusion did not end here. In his lectures on the Anglican Prayer-Book, he made us first acquainted with the Missal and Breviary, as the sources from which all that is best and noblest in that compilation is derived.*"[1]

Here we certainly trace a link of connection between certain French priests and the first Tractarians; but there is no evidence of plot or conspiracy. It was a shrewd remark of Madam de Stael, that "history almost always attributes to individuals, as to governments, more combination of plans than really existed;" and some Protestant alarmists ascribe too much to the deep plotting of the Jesuits and the Roman Curia. There seems to us no need to suppose a conspiracy in order to account for the Tractarian movement, which was

[1] "Historical Notes of the Tractarian Movement, 1865," p. 13.

nothing but the natural result of the Church principles ardently entertained by its leaders, and which has advanced simply because such principles find support in the traditions and formularies of the English Church.

It is one thing to say that this movement originated at Rome, another thing to say that it tends to Rome. The former may not be true; the latter certainly is. At the outset, the chief Tractarians disclaimed all thought of secession to Rome; and though hundreds have seceded, the prominent men in the advocacy of Ritualism at this day loudly assert that they love not Rome, and have no desire to introduce what they blandly call "Continental Christianity" into England. But all through the progress of this movement, there has evidently been in the minds of its promoters a very profound reverence for the Latin Church; an uneasiness under the circumstance that the present Church of England is held at Rome to be a mere schismatical sect, without valid orders or sacraments; an extreme anxiety to secure some measure of ecclesiastical recognition and to recover ultimately ecclesiastical union. Accordingly they have given all possible prominence to the points of belief and the forms of language which the Church of England holds in common with the Church of Rome, have talked of "the essential impiety of Protestantism," and have raised that inquiry for "authority" which leads so many minds to the Roman submission.

It is not necessary to ascribe this to Jesuitical wiles, or to impugn the sincerity of those who, while deprotestantising the Church, declare at the same time that they have no wish to Romanise it. So said Archbishop Laud.[1] And so said the

[1] Very close is the correspondence between the followers of Laud and those of Pusey. Of the former, Dr Thomas Goodwin has said: "They boast themselves to be opponents to the Papal faction, yet do they bring in an image of Popish worship and ceremonies, adding to some old limbs, never cast out, other substantial parts of altars, crucifixes, second service, and the like, so to make up a full likeness in the public service to that of the Popish Church. And, as in worship, so in doctrine, they seek to bring in a presence in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, beyond that which is spiritual to faith, which yet is not Popish transubstantiation; a power in priests to forgive sins, beyond that which is declarative, yet not that which mass priests arrogate; justification by works, yet not so grossly as in the way of Popish merit, but as a condition of the gospel as well as faith; and many the like to these; thus truly setting up an image of old Popery in a Protestant reformed way, even as Popery is an image of heathenish worship in a Christian way. Say these men what they will, that they hold not of the Pope, nor any way

late Bishop Wilberforce again and again. He would be Anglo-Catholic, but not Roman Catholic. He would restore rites and ceremonies, as Old English, not necessarily Roman or Italian; and would impose them on the authority of Christian antiquity, without yielding submission to the See of Rome. But when the minds of men are eagerly turned to the authority of the visible Catholic Church, they find it very difficult to rest in the bosom of a mere local church like the Anglican, out of communion with the great historical Latin Church of the west, and controlled by Acts of Parliament; and inevitably Ritualism projects all who receive it towards Rome. Whether the Anglo-Catholics go over as individuals, or move, as they desire to do, the whole English Church nearer to the Latin, it is the Papal Church that gains. The fruit is ripening on the tree, and Archbishop Manning or Monsignor Capel has only to shake the branches at proper intervals, and secure the ripe results of Ritualism. We do not say that they do it consciously or intentionally, but we do say that the Anglo-Catholic clergy have enfeebled and honey-combed the resistance which the English Church formerly presented to Romanism, have fostered ideas of Divine worship, and of priestly functions and prerogatives, which have their full realisation only in the Latin Church, and in fact, have created appetites which mere Anglicanism is unable to appease. Therefore they are really doing the work of Romish proselytism, and if one may so speak, playing jackal to the Pope.

But while all this damage has been done to the character and tone of the English Church, what have the Evangelical men been doing? If not so numerous as those of the High Church school, still the Evangelical clergy have far outnumbered the Tractarians and Ritualists; and with the support of the laity, should have made a very stout resistance to the Anti-Protestant movement. Alas! they have had enough to do to vindicate their own right to continue as a party within the Church, without assuming to be the representatives of the whole Church. They have signed protests and manifestoes against the new movement, have encouraged inept suits at law to restrain certain practices, have called on the bishops, and

intend him, or the introducing of his religion into these churches, yet their actions do, and cannot but make all men number them as such."—*Goodwin's Works* (Nichol's ed.), vol. iii. p. 71.

shouted to the people, to do something vigorous; but they have lost ground year by year, and present the aspect of a baffled and discredited party. Mr Matthew Arnold has complimented them on what must be, to conscientious men, anything but a source of satisfaction, that they are "of the same confraternity with men who hold that their Scriptural Protestantism is all wrong." But he proceeds to say: "This party is losing the future, and feels that it is losing it. The best of their own younger generation, the soldiers of their own training, are slipping away from them, and he who now looks for the source whence popular Puritan theology derives power and popularity, will not fix his eyes on the Evangelical clergy of the Church of England."[1] Such language is heard on every side. It cannot be denied that the Evangelical clergy are still four or five thousand in number, and that among them and the laity of this school are to be found the sweetest illustrations of individual Christian piety; nevertheless, as a party, they have little political influence, no literary prestige, no rising men, and no inspiring hope of victory. And why is this? Because they have never learned combination, have no competent leaders, have no facility in their church constitution for forming opinion, uniting supporters, and carrying measures; but are now appealing to the bishops, now rushing to the courts of law, now agitating through societies, each of which has its own pet policy and obstructs the others. But the deepest reason of the weakness of the party is, in our judgment, that they have no clear, sound, and well-defined platform on which to combine. They have good historical ground as the successors in theology of the reforming bishops of the sixteenth century, and of the Herveys, Romaines, and Cecils of more recent times. But, even so, they can only claim to be a party in the Church, and cannot allege that the Church of England should be, in their sense, and exclusively, evangelical. They cannot even make out that Evangelicalism is the most proper and legitimate outgrowth of their Church system. Reviewing the tone and course and literature of that Church, from the days of Queen Elizabeth till now, we feel compelled to say that the evangelical clergy have not so clear a title as the High Church party to be considered its faithful exponents. They are Low Churchmen, not fully exhibiting the spirit with

[1] "Pref. to Essay on St Paul and Protestantism," p. 9.

which the Church is fraught. But their rivals are High Churchmen, strong and unembarrassed, because they are in full accord with the teaching and tendency of a prelatic half-reformed church.

The evangelical clergy claim our sympathy, and it is easy to give it to them, but not so easy to treat their ecclesiastical position and policy with respect. They do not seem to be aware how much they are prejudiced in the eyes of the most friendly onlookers, by denying baptismal regeneration, and yet affirming it as often as they read the baptismal office; denying clerical priesthood, and yet accepting the name of priests; denying confession to a priest and absolution by him, and yet using and even lauding a prayer-book which provides for both. Worse still, the majority of them dread and deprecate agitation for the amendment, in these very particulars, of the Liturgy and Catechism, and prefer to trust to interpretations of the Prayer-Book quite as evasive as the Tractarian interpretations of the Articles. It is on this account that they receive less consideration than their character and their fidelity to Divine truth would otherwise command. They are in an equivocal position; and, illogical and provisional as Englishmen are in regard to old institutions and parties, nothing can prevent an equivocal position from involving essential weakness and serious disadvantage.

It pains us to write these words; but institutions inevitably produce results in accordance with their own nature. It is the nature of the Church of England to produce High Churchmen, because they best express its essential genius and tendency; and evangelical men must be content to live on sufferance, and cannot hope to establish themselves as the representative Churchmen of the future, without such changes in the constitution of the Church as would certainly rend it asunder.

We wait to see how long our evangelical friends can retain their faith in the royal supremacy, the episcopal government, and the incomparable liturgy. Practically, the royal supremacy means the control of the Church by a Parliament in which many sit who are not even members of that Church; the appointment of archbishops and bishops by the Prime Minister of the day; and the reference of all church questions to the law of the land, and not to the revealed will of the Lord

Jesus Christ. Then the episcopal or rather prelatic government is the most cumbrous and inefficient administration in England. It has pretention without power, and exhibits a helplessness which provokes and incurs ridicule. Appeals are made to the most reverend and right reverend fathers in God to defend the flock from false teachers; and the said fathers appeal to all parties to be moderate and prudent, and avoid extremes. But no man is willing to admit that he is immoderate or extreme; and party spirit is fast throwing the Church into a condition of anarchy. Its constitution induces men to lean on ecclesiastical superiors, but those superiors do, and can do, nothing effectual in time of peril, and a new cry begins to rise, "What is the use of our bishops?" The third idol has been the Prayer-Book; and now we see this unceremoniously knocked from side to side in the controversial arena. The more determined Protestants demand its revision because it contains remnants of Popery; on the other hand, the advanced Ritualists express a wish for its revision, because it has traces of the Reformation. So the old confidences are shaken, and doubts are raised which may lead to very serious and sweeping conclusions.

Another confidence however remains, and often finds expression. It is said that the great people of England, hitherto incredulous of real danger, will ere long arise in their might, and make short work of the Sacerdotalists. Yet what symptom is there of this? It is true that the proposal to appoint authorised confessors has led to an explosion in the form of manifestoes and public meetings; but where is there any sign of an intelligent and effective popular resistance to the ritualistic advance? There is a resistance of *inertia;* but this, coming of ignorance or indifference, is an ignoble thing at best, and never to be relied on as a defence of the faith. It is said, however, that the laity will soon shake off indifference, vindicate the truth, and rectify the church. A terrible reflection on the church administration, that the clergy can do nothing, and the laity, who have been excluded from office and dignity, should do everything! The officers are at their wit's end, and therefore the rank and file are to set the battle in array and defeat the foe!

So be it. Serious mischief is brewing, and we want a good popular agitation against the Disreformers, and a revival of

the dormant Protestantism of the nation. In such a movement, it would well become faithful men of the Church of England to take the lead, inasmuch as it is from their communion that the danger threatens. If they would only rise to the greatness of the occasion, quit themselves like men, and commit themselves to the cause of a reformation according to God's Word, with a resolute purpose to save their church and country from apostasy, we should certainly hold all true Nonconformists bound in conscience to forget the disputes they have waged and the contumely they have suffered, to rally round those who make a stand for the defence of the gospel, and to share with them the glorious task of rousing and invigorating the evangelical Protestant convictions of the English people.

Knowing the difficulties of our friends in the Established Church, we have waited for them with patience. But they try our patience too much, and sicken our hearts with hope long deferred. Month after month goes by, still marked by ritualistic progress and evangelical helplessness. There has been of late a series of public meetings to protest against systematic confession and absolution, and to assert that they have no countenance in the Prayer-Book! But there is no sign of either will or power to grapple with the questions involved in a spirit of searching and resolute reform. And we must confess that we begin to despair—not of the truth or of England, but of any effectual and sufficient action initiated in the Established Church.

Now, just as this becomes clear to our unwilling eyes, there rises the prospect of disestablishment. Some seem to be afraid to insist on a reform of the church, lest in the process it should be broken up. But the policy of inaction and timidity, which they take to be prudence, is still more certain to denationalise it and bring about an ecclesiastic catastrophe. The Ritualists scorn the prudence, and hate the Erastianism of their opponents; and every hour of their progress brings the church nearer to disestablishment. Hence the urgent necessity that the Protestant party should define and declare their course of action. If they mean to do no more than they are doing at present, the sooner disestablishment comes the better, because every day is strengthening the ritualistic party, and throwing more influence and property into their hands. This influence will secure for them the best terms and

the most valuable church property when they are disestablished and disendowed; and a measure, which many suppose would tend greatly to the furtherance of the gospel, might, on the contrary, set up the most formidable hindrance to it that can be imagined—viz., an immense Anglo-Catholic communion larger by far in our island than the Roman Catholic, equally opposed to the truth as it is in Jesus, and in the uncontrolled possession of vast resources, including some at least of our finest historical buildings, such as St Paul's Cathedral itself. But to the dilemma of reform or disestablishment it must come, if England is to be rescued from religious, and so also from moral and intellectual, declension and eclipse. If that Reformation which was left incomplete three centuries ago can now be resumed and made more perfect, we prefer that alternative, simply because conservative reform is to our minds wiser and nobler than destruction. But if this is not even to be seriously attempted, and the Protestants in the Church of England are to content themselves with a mere position of sufferance, we do not think that the nation should tolerate any longer this state of things; and we must join in the demand for an Act of Disestablishment, which, though it might unfortunately put resources into dangerous hands, would at all events liberate the State in the future from complicity in the teaching and practice of superstition, and give really reformed Christianity, if not a perfectly fair field, a fairer one than it can now be said to enjoy.

Laudism brought on a national convulsion. The Anglicanism of our time, which out-lauds Laud, will in all likelihood bring on another. It cannot have the same effect on the State, because happily Queen Victoria is a very different sovereign from King Charles I., and constitutional government is safe. But it can, and most probably will, throw the Church into immense confusion.

At such a time, it becomes nonconforming Christians to take counsel and action together, as sound Protestants and honest patriots. If their fathers had not been driven out of the Church of England, they would have saved that Church from the sacerdotalism which has always plagued, and threatens now to ruin it. If in their present position they cannot help the Church, they may still do very much to save the nation from a shameful retrogression, under the misleading name of a

revival. Would that, at such a crisis, the Nonconformity of England were less disintegrated and miscellaneous, more compact and organised than it is!

We venture to add, that the position and policy of the Presbyterian Church have, at this period, a peculiar importance. That church is no sect formed out of the Church of England, but the greatest of all the Reformed Churches in the world. Its constitution is that which the reformers from Popery, almost without exception, approved as scriptural and primitive. The thoroughly reformed and reforming party in the Church of England itself desired to adopt that constitution. It is well and fitting that Presbyterians should make themselves heard in England again, and renew their testimony. They can prove that their fathers gave warning of the Popish errors that lurked in the liturgy and ceremonies; and they can point to the present condition of the Church in evidence that those warnings were well founded. They can do more. They can shew how a church of any extent may be governed without royal supremacy, sacerdotal hierarchy, or democratic caprice, and how it may be preserved from Ritualism and Popery; for the Presbyterian or Reformed Catholic Church has in all countries rejected and withstood that mediæval pseudo-Catholicity which an Episcopal Church, established or not, has never yet known how to exclude. In our opinion, the Ritualist Dr Littledale has spoken the simple truth, in saying: "The distinguishing peculiarity of the Episcopal office is, that it is fundamentally anti-Protestant." On the other hand, in the Presbyterian Church, Protestantism is safe; for upon its bulwarks Ritualism and Romanism can make no impression whatever. Therefore, to revive and extend such a church, with well-ordered liberty and spiritual fervour, seems to us the best service which can be rendered to English Christianity in this troubled and distracted time.

DONALD FRASER.

## ART. IV.—*The Hamah Inscriptions: Hittite Remains.*

THE British public are aware that plaster casts or fac-similes of the Hamah inscriptions were secured before the stones were consigned to the limbo of the Constantinople Museum. The public will now have an opportunity of examining these inscriptions for themselves, as Mr Green, H.B.M.'s Vice-Consul at Damascus, by whose exertions and personal influence the casts were secured, presented his copies to the Foreign Secretary, Lord Granville, who has handed them over to the British Museum. The present writer has forwarded duplicate copies to the Palestine Exploration Fund Society, for whom they were taken. In a memorandum, forwarded along with the casts, and which will probably appear in the papers of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," it is pointed out that "the stones were dressed narrow towards the parts on which the inscriptions were found, and the bases were undressed for several feet. Apparently they had been inserted in masonry with the dressed and inscribed parts standing out of the wall. They seem to have been intended to be publicly read, and were thus doubtless in the vernacular of the people of Hamath."

This seems to go far to dispose of the theories, that the inscriptions are either Assyrian or Egyptian or Assournasirpal, as Mr Johnson suggests; or Himyaritic or Lybian, according to the suggestion of Mr Hyde Clarke,—none of these languages having ever been in use in the Orontes valley. Captain Burton suggests that the key to the inscriptions may be found in the "*wasm*" of the Bedawin; but the neat appearance and good finish of the insciptions dispel the idea that they are *wasm* or Arab marks; for they have nothing of the scratchy appearance of *wasm*, but have been executed by good instruments and skilful workmen.

The Himyaritic is the language with which the Hamath inscriptions are supposed to have the greatest affinity. According to Mr Poole, "by this term is to be understood the ancient language of southern Arabia generally, not that of the Himyarites only." And, speaking in the same general way, he says, "The Himyaritic in its earlier phases, probably represents

the first Shemitic language spoken in Arabia."[1] From Abu el Fida, however, the great Arab historian, we learn that Himyar was the son of Saba, who built the city Ma'rib, and the famous "Ma'rib dyke, into which flowed seventy rivers;"[2] and that "the sons of Himyar were the kings of Yemen."[3] The Himyaritic as a written language seems to have had its earliest home in Yemen, and it still exists as a living dialect in the adjacent regions, under the name Akhkili.[4] Its natural descendants are the Ethiopic and Amharic. There is no proof that Himyaritic ever existed northward, far from the shores of the Red Sea. The inscriptions found by Mr Cyril Graham,[5] in El Harrah, east of the Hauran, I am inclined to consider Nabathean, similar to two inscriptions in Sulkhad. But should they prove to have an affinity with Himyaritic,[6] I should feel more inclined to agree with Mr Graham that they mark the progress of a people moving southward, than fall in with Captain Burton's theory, though backed up by native tradition, namely, that they mark a stage of the Gassanides, a people of direct Himyaritic extraction, moving toward Damascus[7] from Yemen. The Hamah writing would thus stand in relation of parent to the Harrah inscriptions, and the later Himyaritic. But as the known Himyaritic inscriptions are too far south to have any relation with the Hamah inscriptions, so they are of far too late a date to be classed with them. The foundation of the modern Himyaritic kingdom Mr Caussin places a century before our era; and, according to Mr Renan, "La date des inscriptions Himyaritic semble être le III. et le IV.e Siecle après Jesus Christ."[8] The dates on the Ma'rib dyke are generally supposed to refer to the breakings of the dyke, which events happened about A.D. 100, and again about the advent of Mohammed. Gesenius also, in his introduction to the Hebrew grammar, places the Himyaritic inscriptions in the fourth century, A D. After this, it is

[1] Smith's Bib. Dict., Article "Arabia."

[2] "Abu el Fida," vol. i. p. 70.

[3] "Abu el Fida," vol. i. p. 105. Ed. Constantinople, A. H. 1286.

[4] "Renan Langues Semitiques," 303.

[5] "Journal of R. G. Society," vol. xxviii.

[6] I make the suggestion, that the inscriptions of the Harrah, seen by Mr Graham, were Nabathean, with diffidence; but by his description of the characters, I am reminded of the Nabathean of Sulkhad and Bosra.

[7] "Unexplored Syria," vol. i. p. 147. [8] "Renan Lang. Sem.," p. 315.

somewhat startling to be told by Mr H. Clarke, that 100 of the common era is the latest date "*assigned*" to the Himyaritic, and that the oldest Himyaritic is supposed to be "600 before the common era."[1]

It seems to me unnecessary to infer, that because the Egyptians and Assyrians inscribed their acts in their own land, therefore they wrote them up in the streets of Hamath for the edification of the vanquished Hamathites; or, that because Himyaritic inscriptions have been found about the Straits of Bab el Mandeb, and on the Ma'rib dyke, bearing a resemblance in some of their letters to the characters on the Hamah stone, therefore the Hamah inscriptions are Himyaritic. No one should draw rash conclusions as to the affinity of languages, from the fact of their letters resembling each other; because many letters, often of the same alphabet, are almost identical. For example, in Arabic there are two triplicates and seven duplicates of the letters, only distinguishable from each other by one, two, or three dots, and these distinguishing marks did not exist in the early Cufic. The jud and schin, and the beth, phe, and roph, in Syriac; and the gimel and wosd, and beth, daleth, and resh of the Phœnician, are almost identical. Each letter, however, is distinct and separate from the others, and has its own special value and significance, though at first it is difficult to distinguish between them. Conclusions therefore drawn from the seeming resemblance of the characters of a new language to the letters of a language known, though plausible, may be very fallacious.

It is, no doubt, perfectly philosophical in an inquiry to lay down an hypothesis; but philosophy demands that it remain an hypothesis until proved. Whatever may be the value of the internal evidence of a connection with Himyaritic, furnished by these inscriptions, there is no external evidence pointing to any existence of the Himyarites in the valley of the Orontes. The Egyptians and the Assyrians appeared in the region of Hamath as conquerors or as allies; but they would more likely be engaged in furthering their own interests than in erecting municipal tablets. The language, however, is neither that of Assyria nor Egypt.

Is it not the most rational supposition that these Hamah inscriptions are remnants of the written language of the people

[1] "Unexplored Syria," vol. i. p. 359.

who inhabited Hamath? The question then arises, Have we any information as to who these people were?

Just before the Scythians entered on the stage of history, the Orontes Valley was inhabited by a powerful Hittite race. They were the children of Heth (בְּנֵי חֵת, LXX. Χετταῖοι, and the Khatti of the Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions), son of Canaan. In Genesis x. 18, we read that "the families of the Canaanites spread abroad;" and in Genesis xxiii., we find the Canaanite Hittites at Hebron, in barter with Abraham in modern Syrian phraseology. Further on in the time of Joshua (Joshua i. 4), the Hittites had become so important, that they were put for all the nations of Canaan, and their territory was mentioned as a synonym for the promised land in its full extent: "From the wilderness and this Lebanon, even unto the great river, the river Euphrates; all the land of the Hittites shall be your coasts." In like manner from 1 Kings x. 28, 29, and 2 Kings vii. 6, we learn that there was a powerful and warlike Hittite kingdom, strong in chariots and armies, beyond the boundaries of Palestine, which doubtless included the Hamathites, and other minor branches of the same Canaanite family. It is not sufficiently known what a flood of light Egyptian and Assyrian monuments shed on these Bible statements.

About 1360 B.C., the Hittites were the most formidable enemies of the Egyptians. The Egyptian representations of their armies and chariots, as pictured on the walls of the palace of the great Rameses at Thebes, and again as set forth in the sculptures of Rameses III.,[1] at Medeenet Haboo, fully bear out the sacred record. These paintings and sculptures, with the poem Pentaur,[2] and the treaty[3] of Khetseera, the illustrious king of the Hittites, drawn up in Egypt in the twenty-first year of Rameses II., enable us to fill up the scriptural outlines, and to form a conception of the character and importance of the Hittite kingdom. It was for fear of the hosts of this powerful confederacy, under "the kings of the Hittites," that the Syrian armies of Benhadad fled in confusion from the siege of Samaria. The Syrians heard the noise of chariots and horses, and a great host, "and they said one to another, lo, the King of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites.

[1] Wilkinson's "Anc. Egyptian," vol. i. p. 401.
[2] "Rougé Revue Contemporaine," No. 106, p. 389. [3] Parthenon, 1862.

. . . . Wherefore they arose and fled in the twilight, and left their tents, and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and fled for their life." "The Pharaohs of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties, waged fierce wars with these Hittites, who were then ruled by a great king and many chiefs, and whose principal arm was a force of chariots resembling those of the Egyptian army."[1] Sir J. G. Wilkinson, in his work on the ancient Egyptians, has given us a woodcut[2] of a painting in Thebes, in which is drawn up a Hittite phalanx, beside a fortified Hittite city. The winding river and bridges are suggestive of Hamah, and the central elevation, manned by archers on its towers, points to the great mysterious mound in the centre of the city, and perhaps offers a key to unlock the mystery of the artificial mounds which are scattered throughout all the great plains of Syria.[3] Again,

"In the Assyrian inscriptions, as lately deciphered," says Mr Grove, "there are frequent reference to a nation of Khatti, who formed a great confederacy ruled by a number of petty chiefs, whose territory also lay in the valley of the Orontes, and who were sometimes assisted by the people of the sea coast, probably the Phœnicians ('Rawlinson's Herodotus,' vol. i. p. 436). If the identification of these people with the Hittites should prove to be correct, it agrees with the name *Chat*, as noticed under Heth, and affords a clue to the meaning of some passages, which are otherwise puzzling."[4]

Wilkins, in his "Phœnicia and Israel," in speaking of the great empire that had overshadowed Israel from opposite sides says:

"We have already referred to the decline of the Egyptian power under the twentieth and twenty-first dynasties; but a similar loss of strength

---

[1] R. S. Poole, Article "Egypt." Smith's Bible Dict.

[2] "Anc. Egyptians," vol. i. p. 400.

[3] These mounds are very numerous in the plains of Hums and Hamah. Tell-es-Salahiyeh, a mound of sun-dried brick, 100 feet high by 900 diameter, near Damascus, has had a little unskilful digging done on its sides; but the scanty results should not discourage a skilful excavation of the mound. I have sometimes myself picked up a dozen of coins on it of an evening. A few days ago I rode to the Tell with an Australian student, and in half an hour I picked up four coins, and the little urchins whom I put in motion brought me twenty-one. Fragments of Mosaics are also scattered over the mound. Most of the coins have palm-trees, but the inscriptions are almost illegible. They are No. 3 of Mionnet.

[4] G. Grove, Article "Hittites." Smith's Bible Dict.

seems to have befallen the empire of Assyria, so that all her possessions west of the Euphrates were taken from her by the conquering Khitas."[1]

Now, these Khattas, or Khitas, or Hittites (for the radicals are the same), waged long wars with powerful empires, and though frequently vanquished, often came out victorious in the end. They had relations, warlike and peaceful, with Egypt, Assyria, and Phœnicia—nations that inscribed their achievements in conspicuous places, in the language of the people. As we have seen, one of the Hittite kings went to Egypt to conclude a treaty of peace in the reign of Rameses II., which Manetho, the Egyptian historian of the time of Ptolemy I., places about the middle of the fourteenth century B.C. A copy of the treaty is still extant, and throws some light on the gods and godesses of the Hittites, who were appealed to as witnesses of the compact.[2]

Now, it is not at all likely that the Hittites would live surrounded by such literary nations as the Egyptian, Assyrian, Jewish, and Phœnician, occupying so large a place in their estimation, and maintaining their ground so well, in war and peace, without having a literature of their own, or at least a written language. Mr Johnson says: "We should naturally expect in this vicinity, some trace of the Assyrian and Egyptian conquerors, who have ravaged the valley of the Orontes, and of their struggles with the Hittites on this ancient battlefield, and of Solomon who built stone cities in Hamath;"[3] but it seems to me much more natural and rational that we should find here some trace of the Hittites themselves. Their relations with Assyria, peaceful and warlike, were extensive; they seem to have been in alliance with the Phœnicians, who were no doubt their carriers by sea; and in addition to their intercourse with the Egyptians, in waging wars and concluding treaties, we read in the Bible that the Hittites had commercial relations with Egypt for war chariots and horses.[4]

When Khetseera visited Egypt, he would see in the temples

[1] "Phœnicia and Israel." Burney Prize Essay for 1870. By A. S. Wilkins.

[2] R. S. Poole, Article "Hittites." Kitto's Bib. Literature.

[3] American P. E. Society, July 1872, p. 32.

[4] 1 Kings x. 28, where we have the price of the horses furnished to the Hittites; 150 shekels of silver each, which, reckoning the shekel at 2s. 8½d. or 2s. 6d., would make the price £17, 2s., or £18, 15s.

of Thebes and El Karnak and Memphis, the record of victories gained over his ancestors; and he, or his more victorious successors, might also trace on stone the records of the achievements which they wished to perpetuate. It seems to me most probable that these inscriptions are of Hittite origin, for the Scythic invasion seems to have passed, leaving no permanent remains.

Internal evidence also points in the same direction; for some of the characters bear a remote resemblance to the letters of the three nations with whom the Hittites were in most active relations—Assyria, Egypt, and Phœnicia; and hence most[1] of those who have written on the Hamah inscriptions, speak of the language as forming a link between the hieroglyphic and phonetic styles of writing. We must be careful, however, as to the conclusions we draw from such resemblance.

From all the evidence before me, external and internal, I am inclined to believe that we have in these inscriptions some declaration from the Hittites themselves. We have, up to the present time, only known them on the testimony of their neighbours. I need not say with what interest we await their utterance after their long silence.

It has been suggested to me by a fellow-labourer in the Syro-Arabic field, that these inscriptions are a copy of the ten commandments for the barbarians of the northern boundary of the promised land. But may we not here have some account of Joshua's wondrous conquest, when the Hittites were driven back; or of the relations of King David and King Toi (2 Sam. viii. 10), or of the marriage of Solomon with a Hittite wife (1 Kings xi. 1), or his building of the store cities of Hamath (2 Chron. viii. 4). We must however labour to unlock these mysteries, not with the view of finding something sensational in them, or for the purpose of proving some theory, but from a pure love of knowing what they really contain; and I doubt not that thus proceeding in the right method of investigation, we shall reach results satisfactory to the most utilitarian scholars. Even though they should turn out to be only tombstones, as some suppose, we shall at least, I believe, ascertain whether the language of the Hittites

[1] Mr Wm. R. Green, H.B.M.'s vice-consul, Damascus; and Johnson, Burton, and Doaki.

was Shemitic or not, a question which, up to the present, remains unsettled.

In bringing this subject to a close, it seems to me that we have shewn sufficient reason for not accepting any of the suggestions at first thrown out with respect to the origin and language of these inscriptions.

From the shape and appearance of the stones themselves, we infer that they were built into structures, with the inscribed parts standing out, so as to be publicly read. It is thus very improbable that they would be inscribed in a foreign tongue, and incredible that they should be the work of an enemy. Had they been traces of the enemies who ravaged the Orontes Valley, they would have been destroyed when the enemy turned his back. But we know who the enemies of the Hittites were, and the characters on the stones are not those of their language, as written at the time of their conquests. Again, the workmanship of the inscriptions, which are in relief, like most Cufic and Arabic inscriptions, shews nothing of the *scratchy* appearance of the incised *Bedawi-wasm* with which we are acquainted. It is hardly necessary again to repeat that the inscriptions are neither Egyptian nor Assyrian; and it has been shewn that the Himyaritic is too late, as a written language, and geographically too remote from the Orontes Valley to favour the supposition that the Hamah inscriptions are Himyaritic. It is possible that the Himyaritic may be the descendant of the Hamath, and the inscriptions east of the Hauran point in that direction; but until we know more of the nature of the Harrah inscriptions, we cannot say anything definite on the subject. It may be suggested that they are some remnant of the Scythic invasion; but that event was of so ephemeral a character that it was not likely to leave such permanent remains in the country over which it swept.

We have thus endeavoured to shew what the Hamah inscriptions are not; and we believe we have pointed out what they probably are. They are doubtless the work of a people settled in the country at a remote period, having relations with the surrounding nations of Egypt, Assyria, Phœnicia, and Israel; for the inscriptions bear traces of the influence of the language of each of these nations. The Bible tells us of a great Hittite kingdom beyond Jewish boundaries

in the north; and its statements, which have been obscure and puzzling, have recently received confirmation from the inscriptions of Egypt and Assyria. It is very improbable that a great kingdom, so far advanced in the arts of war and peace as the Hittites were, should be without a written language, or any inscribed records of their own achievements, while they were in constant intercourse and rivalry with nations on every hand which inscribed their triumphs in hall and palace to their own glorification.

But, I have been asked: "If the Hittites were capable of producing such perfect inscriptions as these, how is it that these are the only remains they have left us?" To this it may be replied, that these are not the only remains they have left, for Mr Drake discovered others in Aleppo, and there remains in Hamah at least the second half of the fragmentary inscription No. I. It need not surprise any one that other inscriptions of the same kind have not been discovered, for archæologists have known of the existence of these for sixty-one years, without making any effort to secure them. It must also be remembered that the destroying Scythians swept southward over the plains of Syria; that for several centuries the Seleucidæ dynasty, with their wonderful mania for building and rebuilding, ruled over the whole of northern Syria; that the Romans succeeded the Greeks; that the Moslems drove out the Byzantines; that barbarous hordes of western crusaders captured and sacked most of the towns in the Orontes plain; and that now, for several centuries, the Turk, like the genius of destruction, has fulfilled his destiny by turning the fertile plains of Syria into barren wastes, and her splendid cities into ruinous heaps. The spoilers have been in the land of the Hittites for over 2500 years, and it need not be wondered at if most of their monuments have disappeared. When we remember that during the last century only three or four educated travellers have explored the north of Syria, and that in a very hasty manner, we may reasonably predict that these Hamah inscriptions will prove the first fruits of a rich harvest to be gleaned by the industrious and intelligent antiquary in the "gathering in of Hamath."

I am sorry to add that Englishmen, in the present state of English influence in Turkey, will have great difficulty in securing any monuments they may find. It would not be

pleasant to smuggle out of the country, as Consul Lang[1] did in Cyprus, what they may have laboured hard and paid dear to obtain, and that at the risk of having their treasures confiscated and themselves tried before a Turkish tribunal; and it is desirable, above all things, that no Englishman shall ever resort to that impotent and fussy peddling, which led to the destruction of the Moabite stone.

WILLIAM WRIGHT, A.B.

---

## ART. V.—*The New Reading of the History of Israel.*

*Geschichte des Volkes Israel.* Von HEINRICH EWALD. Bd. I. *Die Einleitung.* Bd. II. *Die Gottherrschaft.* Bd. III. *Die Königherrschaft.* Bd. IV. *Die Heiligherrschaft.* Bd. V. *Geschichte Christus' und seiner Zeit.* Bd. VI. *Geschichte des Apostolischen Zeitalters.*[2]

1. AT length one has arisen to do for the history of Israel what Niebuhr did for the history of Rome; and in these massive volumes we have the quintessence of historical truth distilled from the Bible. The work which the Reformation commenced, but left uncompleted, and which has been in suspense these three hundred years, has been resumed by a master, and carried to its logical *ultimatum*, and now Bibliolatry lies shivered into ruins. Here is an answer to the inquiry, said to be *the* question of the hour, how to retain as a practical conviction faith in Christianity as eternal truth, without the aid of the artificial prop of an infallible book hitherto deemed essentially necessary. Here is Christianity pure and simple, freed from the incrustations and morbid growths of ages past,—a Christianity all throbbing with life, and glowing with moral enthusiasm, of which Christ is heart and head, and in which He shines infinitely great and glorious

[1] See letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, from Alexandria, 12th December 1872, by Mr H. Lang, director of the Imperial Ottoman Bank, Alexandria, and ex-Consul at Larnica.

[2] History of the People of Israel. By Heinrich Ewald. Vol. I. Introduction. Vol. II. The Theocracy. Vol. III. The Monarchy. Vol. IV. The Hagiocracy. Vol. V. History of Christ and His Time. Vol. VI. History of the Age of the Apostles.

—but a Christianity without superstition and without idolatry. And finally, here, in finished symmetry, we have presented to us the form of doctrine towards which all Christendom has, these many years back, been invisibly moving, and the goal is clearly defined towards which, from innumerable pathways, the feet of all true inquirers are making. Ewald is harbinger of the church of the future. Is it so? Or, is all this ponderous learning misdirected and erratic? Is this great and glowing book only a wild romance? Would its writer carry the Christian Church back to a hollow and unfruitful Ebionism? Can it be that the Christian centuries have been dominated by error, and their creations only the building of a tower of Babel? Is Ewald only shrinking in terror from the majesty of Christianity,—nothing but a fervent arch-heretic? We raise a profoundly important question,—it is already before us; and in its presence, most of the controversies, the noise of which fills the air, seem sheer idleness. A beginning has already been made in the translation of Ewald's great work, and it will speedily be before the English public. It is of the kind which for the time being *magnetizes* the reader, and no one acquainted with it can doubt that it will be much read, exercise a profound influence, and make many converts: indeed, it is already discernible that Ewald is powerfully controlling theological thought. We propose, therefore, as faithfully as possible, to reproduce Ewald's view of the nature and development of Christianity, as the true and absolute religion, and also to subject it to such criticism as will test its validity, and shew what insuperable difficulties it has to encounter before it can hope to obtain the acceptance of Christendom,—nay, how it contains within itself the elements of self-refutation and self-destruction.

2. With Ewald's negative position we may be brief. The idea of an infallible Divine book, every word of which records actual history, is superstition, one which flagrantly ignores the very aspect which the Bible wears, and can only be bolstered up by a system of pious fraud. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is a groundless tradition, and, to modern criticism, even a self-evident absurdity and impossibility. The Athanasian creed is idolatry. The Prophets of Israel were only the embodiment of the theocratic spirit, and the Apostles only Christians who had drunk most deeply into

the mind of Christ, otherwise entirely creatures of their age, with all its imperfections and limitations. There is no such thing as prophecy in the sense of a supernatural knowledge of the future. Its utterances are only the intuitions and forebodings of religion evolving its contents and aiming towards self-completion, or sure calculations on the ground of the relation of the eternal righteousness to the world. Nor is there any such thing as a miracle. What seems a miracle is only a higher law—the dynamic force of spirit over matter; and narratives of miracles only shew how religion, looking back, idealises and glorifies its own manifestations in life and history. There are no angels, and there is no kingdom of darkness. The idea of angels is the poetry of religion, and the idea of devils is of foreign growth, one which obtruded itself on Israel, and, from a combination of circumstances, unhappily obtained possession. The true religion is no supernatural revelation, but only the culmination of a natural historical process—for the human mind has a natural determination towards it—and Christ is therefore only ideally from heaven, but really only the ripe fruit of humanity. God's relation to the world and method of dealing with men is uniform from age to age, and fixed as nature's course. In all past time history pursued its course as now, and all the history of the past was shaped by the same forces which shape modern history. There never was a cessation of supernatural interventions, for there never was a supernatural intervention. But all this is only the shadow cast by the body of Ewald's positive doctrine, and therefore it chiefly concerns us to apprehend his affirmations.

3. The point of departure is found in the conception of religion. Religion is a fact in the world, not simply a theory or speculation, but a fact of immediate consciousness and experience. Every man who has found it would as soon question his own existence as its reality, and wherever it reveals itself it makes itself known as the highest and greatest of all the possessions of the human mind. Although the impulse towards religion is native to man, and he cannot be otherwise than religious, it is at the same time necessary that he should be quickened from without,—for the most part by the pressure of physical and spiritual wretchedness,—that his higher self may awake and seek God. When in such an hour a man descends into the unsearchable depths within himself,

he finds God already there, Who reveals Himself to him as the Holy One and the Saviour,—at once as a flaming fire consuming the evil, and as inexpressible love lending health and might to the spirit, whereby it swings itself away over all evil, and feels itself blessed, saved, redeemed. He who has attained this experience becomes a new man, is henceforth spiritual (*pneumatikos*), and indeed in the measure of the intensity and purity of his experience, is a prophet and light of men, for has he not seen God and heard His voice, even with the same certainty with which his eye has seen the face of man and his ear heard the sighing of the wind? There neither is nor can be any inspiration but this, and this, too, is revelation.

This immediate experience, which we name religion, proves itself to be an altogether searchless well-spring of spiritual thought and truth, and light begins to radiate from it, till it alters the whole aspect of heaven and earth. Indeed, the Bible is only the progressive evolution of its contents. We are taught by it, with immediate demonstration, that the true God, the only one Who can redeem, is a purely spiritual Being, Who fills the heaven and the earth, is near every soul that seeks him, and is to be apprehended by a purely spiritual act alone in the sanctuary of the soul; and lo! idolatry rises up before the mind as a lie and an abomination, and Egypt becomes a land of spiritual leprosy. In the inward search for God under the pressure of wretchedness, a man comes to know himself as spirit, as greater than earth and sky, possessed of a life which mountains of matter cannot crush, of a force which, when released by the breath of God, looks out into eternity; and lo! the materialism of heathendom vanishes, terror of material forces disappears, and God the Spirit is recognised as the one controlling force that fills the universe, whose voice hurls back the waves of the sea, and makes as stubble the war-horses of Egypt. Is not, further, all Polytheism thus annihilated, and the truth that there is one God only eternally rooted in the soul? The abominable conceptions of the character of God which obtain in heathendom, now disappear as night before the rising sun; for He has been revealed as the Holy One,—*i.e.*, as the loving-righteous One, whose very anger burns as a fire to consume evil and save from it; whose very righteousness is therefore only a form of love. All the moral truth contained in the Decalogue is wrapt up in this

experience: the spiritual man has heard himself addressed by that majestic "I," impelling him towards a pure and loving life. May we not, therefore, well name it revelation from on high? What other or better divine inspiration can there be?

Not only is religion light, it is also force,—an altogether wonderful and most central moral force,—"threshing the mountains and beating them small, and making the hills as chaff." It is fire in the heart. Its every truth is apprehended as the voice of the Eternal commanding. It feels itself in league with the Lord of Hosts. Where it comes, it comes as the rushing down of heavenly forces into the life of man and the course of history. In this sense, the sphere of religion is the sphere of miracles. It is inevitable that its high spring-tides should be associated with theophanies and visions of angels, "the earth trembling, and discovering its foundations, and the perpetual hills bowing." Where it fires souls, it inspires them with such enthusiasm, so thrills mind, heart, and arm, that the course of history becomes a story of marvels and a record of deeds so amazing, that the doers of them recognise the hand and arm of Jehovah. Religion is the central force in the world; it controls all history; is the divinely conquering might which will subdue and refashion all things.

4. Such, then, is religion. Now, every truth which is destined to become the possession of many, or the common possession of the race, must first of all become, most inwardly and firmly, the possession of one man, in whom it reveals all its glory and all its might. Such a man arose. The man Moses attained to this experience, which is true religion, in such a manner as no other before him had done, and as no other after him did, before Christ came; possessed it with unexampled intensity, purity, might, and clearness; and also by a reflective act made its substance the conscious treasure of his spirit as it never before had filled any human spirit. Also, he obeyed it with the most rigorous earnestness, following its guidance into thought and action with undeviating truthfulness. Once, in deepest silence and hiddenness, the divine fire shone before his eyes and thrilled his spirit,—he saw God and heard God, and his hour had struck. The shepherd becomes a prophet, and arises to obey the voice which speaks within: a prophet and man of God, having obtained the true religion as fully as the age rendered possible, was sent to put his mind

on Israel, and make his individual possession first the peculiar treasure of that nation, and then of all nations.

But it is not to be supposed that Moses was the first man who found the true religion. It had been found by many of his ancestors, and without the inheritance which he had received from them, he could not have become what he was. Nay, in all ages and among all nations, men have sought religion and found it. In Egypt, in China, in India, there have been men who were not inferior to the patriarchs,—possibly little inferior to Moses. How was it then that Moses became the founder of the true religion? How came he to leave his mark on universal history? The age was ripe for him, and circumstances favoured him. The very fascination of the false religion of Egypt, by its sharp antagonism, developed the true religion with unexampled precision; and while all nations have more or less striven to reach the true religion, so much so that it was only as it were by accident that Egypt did not become its home, yet Israel possessed the purest religious instinct and ripest religious genius, and was at that time in such a condition, externally and internally, that it only awaited the summons of the prophet's voice. However, let it be understood that when we speak of Israel, we do not speak of a nation which literally sprang from Abraham; for Israel was the collective name given to successive tribes which had at various times emigrated southward, and at last attracted to the rich and cultivated land of Egypt, had there been fused by a common religious disposition.

Never did man betake himself to a task of greater magnitude than that which now awaited Moses. The religious antagonism between the Egyptians and the Hebrews had at length developed itself to such proportions, that either Pharaoh must utterly crush Israel into submission, or Israel must be permitted to quit Egypt, and seek for itself a new home. There arose a religious war. The actual history of it no longer exists; but we cannot picture to ourselves as too sublime the man who, in such an unequal struggle, gained the victory; and his antagonist is an ever-memorable illustration of the vanity of man's rebellion against truth and right. Israel went forth to seek a new home: having gained in the struggle in Egypt, and in a wonderful deliverance at the Red Sea, such an experience of the hand of the invisible God fighting for them,

that trust in the unseen arm became an imperishable treasure of the people, and in all the future a conviction shaping their history.

But now, what will Moses do with this race which his hand has rescued? Into what shape will he mould them? Whither will he lead them? The soil of the national mind had indeed been prepared for him. Israel was in such a condition of religious susceptibility and elevated enthusiasm, as made it possible for Moses entirely to fill it with right conceptions of the true God, the true religion, the true worship, and the true morality: and the great thoughts of his spirit passed from his lips as a glowing fire, fusing Israel, and enabling him to cast it into the mould which henceforth distinguished it from all other nations. The sublime picture of the giving of the law at Sinai exhibits to us a nation thrilled, from the centre to the circumference, with pure religious enthusiasm, and proclaims to us that now, for the first time, the true religion has ceased to be a sporadic phenomenon, and has become so interwoven with the existence of a nation that it can never more perish, unless that nation can be annihilated: religion will henceforth be interwoven with history. We can therefore well understand how the government of this people became a theocracy,—nay, how it could become nothing else than a theocracy; for it was a religious idea which had fused it into a nation, and the central formative passion of the national mind and heart, was to serve the invisible King Who had delivered them, and Whom it felt ever near in His might, purity, and grace. The theocracy was a sublime and truly gigantic conception,—one possible only to a young people glowing with fresh enthusiasm; one, however, which raised them to a giddy and dangerous height, and which would prove itself inoperative when a Moses was no more, when the oracle was dumb, and the heart of the nation had grown old.

All the higher possessions of the human spirit can only blossom, nay, can be retained only, amid civilisation, order, peace, and external well-being; according to the vision of the Apocalypse, "the earth helps the woman." A home had therefore to be found for Israel. On Canaan all eyes were fixed; and to Canaan Moses would have quickly led the people, had they been altogether worthy. They required, however, long probation, and time for consolidation. Although the generation which came out of Egypt did not reach Canaan, nothing can

convincingly demonstrate the earnestness and purity of the national heart, and the depth of the educational guidance of Moses, than the spectacle of the fervour, prowess, fidelity, and young energy of the subsequent generation, who pursue their way with songs of rejoicing (Numbers xxi.), whose faces were as the faces of lions, and their feet swift as the roes upon the mountains. Moses departed this life without bringing his work fully to completion, but not without the joy of seeing around him a people altogether of the right mind and heart, and a leader in whom he discerned his own spirit reproduced. Joshua, without delay, led the nation to the conquest of Canaan; and such was the martial enthusiasm with which their religion inspired them, such might did it lend to their hands, such rapidity to their feet, that in a very short space of time they had made for themselves a secure habitation. On looking back, it seemed to them that the very river had become dry ground,—that, upon their battle-shout, the ramparts of walled cities had fallen down with a crash,—that the stroke of their sword had been like the raining of stones from heaven,—that so much had been compressed into a short period, that days had surely been gathered into one, as if the very sun had tarried in the heavens till their work was done. Verily, Jehovah had fought for them. And so, at last, there is a strange new thing in the world,—a nation in secure possession of a land and home, having in its keeping the true religion, and conscious of a mission to keep it as its peculiar treasure, and develope it till it is ripe to become the treasure of universal humanity. When will it be? What will be the course of such a nation's history?

5. The next great experience which Israel made, was that of the absolute impossibility of prosecuting its mission and fulfilling its destination, nay, even of retaining the treasures of the past, under a theocracy. Its own religious life and light were by no means absolutely pure and perfect; but, instead of finding itself long in undisturbed possession of the land, and left in such external peace as would permit it thoroughly to exhaust and appropriate its divine treasures, lo! enemies break in upon the right hand and upon the left, the land is well nigh wrenched from its grasp, and its very existence as a nation unceasingly threatened with destruction. Why are we so weak? they asked; but no one could answer

The early glory of Israel under a pure theocracy held the national imagination in such thraldom, that no man ventured to blame it, and every man said that hope and help lay in returning, not in advancing. It required centuries of experience before the nation learned to utter the thought, "It is because we have no king that we are as water spilt upon the ground; give us a king, that we may be united and strong, and, in secure possession of external peace and wellbeing, prosecute our high mission." The theocracy was only a sublime ideal,—like other ideals, unworkable,—and requiring conditions which, in the nature of things, could not long continue. The successive judges whom the necessities of Israel called forth, were imperfect attempts to supply the requisite bond of unity to the nation; for, in spite of heroic lives like those of Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson, Israel fell deeper and deeper, till it felt itself ready to perish from internal anarchy and outward hostility.

It is to Samuel belongs the honour of at last clearly discerning what Israel required, and of peacefully accomplishing the revolution. During his earlier life, he had thought that the salvation of Israel lay in restoring the age of Joshua, and anew building the theocracy on the great truths which he had anew apprehended in all their grandeur, and which he laboured to imprint on the national heart, through the agency of the school of the prophets. He was fully aware of the demand for reformation, but opposed it with all his energy, till at last —recognising its imperative necessity—he became himself the reformer, and introduced the new era. The age of the theocracy ceases, and the age of the monarchy begins; or rather, the monarchy was superinduced upon the theocracy, and there began the era of Basileo-Theocracy. It is important to mark the distinction, for a king in Israel must be other than a king of a heathen nation. He only was competent to be anointed king of Israel, whose inmost soul was theocratic; in whom was concentrated the peculiar spirit of Israel; who was imbued with a profound sense of the peculiar mission of the nation, and who was entirely devoted to the mind and will of Jehovah. It was indeed nothing else than the Messianic hope which burst into expression in the cry, Make us a king. Israel must have such a theocratic king, and if ever he seems not to come, yet ever must be demanded and waited for.

Saul failed—failed to be a true theocratic king: went so far as to shew that he would usurp also the prophetic and priestly office, and found an arbitrary Autocracy. The true king of Israel was found in the son of Jesse; and his life-work shewed how truly Samuel had discerned what alone was wanting to the nation. David was a warrior-patriot, because he inmostly felt and clearly perceived that Israel's national existence and well-being were one with the existence and triumph of the true religion, and that in fighting for Israel he was fighting for God, for truth, for right, for humanity, for redemption. His arm subdued all his enemies round about; his heroic heart created a nation of heroes; his genius made Israel internally united and strong as it never had been. He accomplished everything externally necessary, that the true religion might have a secure habitation, and peace and freedom for its development; and also internally wrought as powerfully towards that end as if he had been a prophet. David handed over a magnificent heritage to his son Solomon; and during his reign, nothing seemed to be wanting that the true religion should ripen to perfection, and take possession of the earth. Wherefore did it tarry? Has not Israel attained its ideal height?

The sad issue of the reign of Solomon, reveals in an astonishing manner at once the sublimity and the overwhelming difficulty of the task assigned to Israel. External prosperity produced its usual demoralising influence, and made the nation worldly and effeminate. The monarchy gradually ceased to be theocratic in its spirit, and became heathenish and worldly after the pattern of Egypt. Solomon prematurely introduced universal toleration of religious beliefs and usages, when as yet the true religion was too little conscious of its nature to resist the fascinations of idolatry, and too weak to stand as a purely spiritual might. Thus was brought about a divorce, nay, a fierce antagonism, between the Prophets and the Court, —between the former as representing the pure theocratic spirit, and the latter as representing the secular rule. Had these two powers only wrought harmoniously, how soon might the grand issue have come! How totally different might have been the history of the kingdom of God! But the nation was brought to the dust by the struggle between prophet and king, a struggle in which each acted tyrannically, and neither knew

that love must reign in God's house. Thus the issue of Solomon's reign is, after all, only to shew that the perfect theocratic king of Israel, who could lead it to its destination, had not yet come,—must, when he comes, be greater than David and greater than Solomon. Would he never come? Will not the next who sits upon the throne of David be he? This cry is the deepest impulse in the time which now begins. Further and further seemed to recede the greatness and glory of the past, feebler and feebler became the hope of their recovery; but deeper and more plaintive became the yearning for the true king, and the conviction that he must come, unless the religion of Israel be a lie, and its vision of a sublime destination a delusion. Still he came not. The house of David became a ruin, and Jerusalem a desolation; and still he came not. These long trials and awful calamities were the means of deepening and purifying the Messianic hope, and were rewarded by this conviction, that Israel can attain its destination only by the coming in absolute perfection of that religion of which it had the beginning, that the only true king of Israel must be the perfect man, who should perfectly realise the life of true religion, and in virtue of it, rule over all with divine power; wherewith also was connected the humbling persuasion, that the form of perfect religion had never yet been seen upon the earth, that there must be a new law and a new covenant, for all that had been was a shadow.

After the captivity, the nation entered anew into possession of the land, with high hopes of recovering all its vanished power and glory; but was doomed to disappointment,—ever renewed disappointment,—and sank into greater external weakness and wretchedness. Its recollection of a magnificent past, its sense of a sublime world-wide destination, still remained, however, glowing secretly and concentrating, till at last the national pride found its exponent in the mind and arm of Judas Zelotes, and in his vain effort to hurl back heathendom as once David did.

The experience of these centuries was a bitter trial and heavy temptation. It had upon a great part of the nation the effect of producing an almost sceptical tone, at least languor and indifference in regard to the Messianic hope. Such a book as Ecclesiastes,—which belongs to this time,—shews how the wretchedness of the age, and the apparent

uselessness of any longer waiting for the hope of Israel, had led even deeper natures to seek satisfaction in a speculative and practical wisdom, all tinged with sadness, and in which the Messiah has no place.

But yet indeed the Messianic hope was as imperishable as religion itself. Wherever the religion of Israel revealed itself, in its divine light and might, the Messianic hope burst forth as an irrepressible fire. And there always was a true Israel hidden in Israel.

In individual religious life, the soul often makes an experience like this: its passionate searchings seem only to remove God further and further away, and to open up a deeper and ever deeper mine of darkness and sin within the heart; greater and more glorious seems the prize which it seeks, and although it seem to recede, deeper and more earnest grows the yearning of the spirit, till at last the blessing comes from out the infinite distance in answer to an unutterable cry. So was it with the true Israel now. It learned more and more to discern the imperfections which adhered to its religion and its inability either to remove or correct them; and thus was led to feel that Messiah must be something absolutely new, accompanied with hitherto unknown power, and must be allured as from out of heaven, by such a general religious fervour as had hitherto belonged to isolated men. The hidden ones cried and waited; and yet the perfect One tarried,—age after age, tarried,—seemed to recede further and further, even as the yearning for him grew softer and more impassioned. Israel was learning to sublimate and glorify (*die Verhimmlichung*) the conception of the King. When he comes, he can be nothing else than perfect religion beaming forth in heavenly lustre and with mighty power. In proportion as he seemed to bury himself in the depths of heaven, and the conviction that he *must* come intensified itself, they began to think of the Messiah as an eternal necessity of the universe, as hidden in God from all eternity, as above all limitations of earth and sense, as the ideal Son of God and architype of humanity as it should have been holy and sublime, never yet had been,—as the Word of God whose coming would be the perfect revelation of the hidden Divine Being. Thus, on the one hand, the image of the Messiah grew more lustrous, and the longing for him more profound and plaintive, till at last the hour

came. All this was at length concentrated in a small circle of elect souls, represented in such as Simeon and Anna, but with fullest intensity in John the Baptist, in whose spirit the image of the King of Israel shone with ravishing beauty; and who gave himself to make ready a people for Him, whom, with fasting, meditation, and ceaseless prayer, he strove to allure as from out the unsearchable depth of God's mercy, struggling as if he would charm living fire from out the stones of the evil time. It was impossible that He could longer tarry. If He had tarried longer the human spirit had been chilled with the night of despair,—Israel had perished, and the world's hopes.

6. At length He came,—quite otherwise than was expected, and yet perfectly responding to all the thoughts and desires of the past, — the Perfect Man, the Incarnation of the true religion, its ideal perfection, the true King of Israel. Out of the unsearchable spirit of man had the greatest and best at last blossomed into being. From the first, Jesus of Nazareth had a divine destination and plenipotence for the work of the Messiah. He saw the task which the age imposed, and for which the age was ripe; it revealed itself to Him at once in its overwhelming difficulty, and in its inexpressible charm and infinite gain, so that He had no rest in His spirit till He grappled with it. It was the voice of John which developed in Jesus to fullest self-consciousness His calling to the Messiahship. With his spirit-glance, John recognised His sinlessness, and beheld the immeasurable grace of the Holy Ghost radiating from His person, and, hailing Him as King of Israel, the spirit of Jesus cried Amen to his voice. It was the hour for which the ages had waited. "The kingdom of God is come because the Perfect Man is here, purest embodiment of true religion, most complete union of the divine and human," is the message which now sounds forth into the world, the *gospel*. "Behold it and believe it,—I am He!" It goes forth as the triumphant shout of a King. It never waxes feeble even in death. He steps forth announcing *Himself* and the kingdom of God in Him, and acts and speaks with royal plenipotence and glory.

All the working of Jesus resolves itself into the revelation of Himself as Perfect Man of God, or Personification of true religion in its ideal glory. The perfect religion shone forth in all His condescending love and royal graciousness, and it

radiates forth in the light, power, tenderness, depth, and heavenly purity of His words. A word, a look, from Him kindled enthusiasm and awoke a Divine life where an inward susceptibility existed. So from age to age, every little act, and every word, stamped with His unique incomparable impress, is found to be charmed with moral force to quicken a higher life and raise men to God. What can compare with the faintest quivering echo of His voice and footfall?

He was a King. His acts could not be common and ordinary. The kingdom of the perfect and true religion must break the power and destructive consequences of sin, and with sin are inseparably connected all human ills, even the corporeal. Into the abyss, therefore, of all the monstrous evils of that hour, Christ descended with all the love and might of His Spirit. He healed physical evils by an intensified spiritual influence, profoundly thrilling the spirit of the patient. Why should it be incredible? Who can lay bare the hidden links of connection between moral and physical evil? between spirit and matter? Who can set limits to the triumphant power of spirit over material force? Who can measure the forces which lay in *that* spirit, in which was realised the highest possible union of God and Man? But let it not be imagined that He wrought His marvellous works in order to attract attention, allure followers, or make converts. He was only revealing Himself as Messianic King in shewing mercy, and wished to be accepted because the light of His spiritual glory was shining with self-evidencing power.

He was a King, and could be no ordinary Rabbi, no teacher of systems. He had but one theme of discourse,—to declare the nature, laws, and duties of the kingdom of God, which was already imperishably in the world since He had come, and to invite and entreat men to come into it, and be as He was, and have what He had. And yet with every opening of His lips truth streams from Him, and power issues from Him. His words drop as the dew, and the celestial beauty of the perfect religion beams forth from Him, so that men hail Him as the Sun of Righteousness.

Thus, acting, speaking, helping, healing, sorrowing, rejoicing, He reveals Himself as the express image of religion,—of humanity altogether filled with God and glorified. Ravished with the spectacle, in ecstasy, men heard heavenly voices

saying, "This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased!"

If Israel had but known its King! If His own had but received Him! But it soon became manifest that as a nation Israel was impenetrable, irrecoverably lost, and both unable and unwilling to own Him. Christ therefore proceeded to gather round Him a band of elect souls—the disciples,—the most susceptible whom His eye could discern, upon whom His image might be imperishably imprinted, and whom He might fashion into the living stones wherewith to lay the foundation of the kingdom of the true religion. In proportion as the hostility of the world increased, He concentrated His activity; and while the world was threatening His work with utter destruction, He was laying its foundation so deep in a hidden circle of souls, that the gates of hell could not prevail against it. The greatest part of His earthly activity consisted in the training of the twelve,—the creation of a body in which His Spirit would continually live and work, and from which it would propagate itself till it filled the whole earth.

Still the world which had once seen and hated Him would not leave Him alone. Its hatred grew fiercer, and as it grew, He answered it only by uninterrupted self-revelation, by ever fuller outstreaming of the whole wealth of His love, purity, and power. Thus on the one hand the image of sin and darkness rose up in its perfect hatefulness, and on the other hand the image of perfect religion rose up in its divine beauty, and there were revealed the abysses of hell and the depths of heaven.

Christ exhausted every means to overcome the hostility of the world, and give a peaceful triumph to His cause. But recognising at last its impossibility, and discerning that He had now so filled with Himself the souls of that select band, which was the germ of all the future, that His cause would triumph even without His personal presence, He quickly addressed Himself to meet the inevitable end, nay, even joyfully, for He saw how temporal ruin would become everlasting glory, how His innocent death would most majestically reveal the glory of His Person as King of the true religion, would prove itself a power to thrill the whole old-world fabric to its very foundations, and break the power of the sin and

guilt of Israel and of wide humanity. Such was His death on the Cross,—the glorification of the Son of Man,—the world-conquering force,—the sacrifice of love for a world needing redemption. It was finished, and Christ disappeared from the stage of time. The world had done its worst, but no power could henceforth destroy the spiritual thing which He had created. He died in shame and woe, to be eternally glorified in spirit through His image in believing souls.

So was He the Son of God as no one hitherto; in mortal body and in fleeting time, the purest brightness and most glorified image of the eternal; and to Him alone must the eyes and hearts of all be directed, who truly seek God. To have His image imprinted on our souls, to have felt the glory and thrilling might of His self-revelation, is life everlasting and purest blessedness.

The hour in which the merely temporal and the purely spiritual in Christ were sundered, was the birth-hour of a new world. As a kind of natural glorification passes upon every human life at death, for all that was impure and imperfect is now clearly recognised and put aside, and all that was pure and good shines more brightly, and works more powerfully, so was it with Christ in the highest degree. He was now glorified. "Glorification" is a word to express the might of the purely spiritual influence of Christ, when His whole self-revelation within time and space was beheld with the eye of the spirit. The tragic and humiliating death of Christ for a few days, cast the minds of the disciples into a state of utter stupor and despair; but speedily they felt His glorious image revive in their hearts, their faith and clear intuition of Him as Messiah and Son of God awoke as from the dead; they had power to apprehend Him as the ever-present and glorified, with such intensity of emotion and inward certainty that it was as if they had seen Him, heard His voice, felt His hand and the breath of His mouth. The narratives of the appearances of the risen Christ present an exact parallel to the theophanies of the Old Testament. They are the forms in which the recollections of His spiritual resurrection clothed themselves,—embodied expression ravishingly declaring the *imperishable* impression made by his whole self-revelation; and in the presence of this great idea, it is but idleness to ask what literally became of Christ's body? Every high experience

of religious enthusiasm and ecstacy, having reached its culminating point, is followed by a sense of rest and soothing in which the substance of the experience quietly nestles down into the heart for an everlasting joy; so also was it with the disciples,—such is the import of the narrative of the Ascension, of the vision of Christ peacefully and with benedictions passing away into the eternal glory and highest heavens, there to *dwell.*

7. Our limits forbid us carrying the narrative into the apostolic age; nor indeed is it for our purpose necessary. Ewald's conception of the nature and development of Christianity, as the true and absolute religion, must now be sufficiently clear. But we feel it to be further necessary, in as few words as possible, to refer to his biblical criticism, or rather to his views concerning the origin of the sacred writings, and the reasons which have determined the shape and character of their contents.

We have heard that the Red Indian, by noting the bending of a twig or blade of grass, can tell who has passed, and track his foe with unerring step; and that a Cuvier, from one little bone, will name and describe the animal to which it belonged. Ewald seems to feel himself endowed with a similar critical faculty, and from indications which the common eye cannot see, to be able to trace the origin of a book, a psalm, nay, a single verse, with an incommunicable tact or instinct. Thus he knows that the book of Deuteronomy was written by a prophet, whom the persecutions of Manasseh had made a fugitive in the land of Egypt, and with a view to revive the theocratic spirit of the age of Moses; that the ninetieth Psalm is a penitential prayer, belonging to the last days of the perishing monarchy; that the forty-fifth Psalm was composed in honour of Jeroboam II., son of Jehu. As a magnet can sunder the particles of steel from a heap of dust, so he puts his hand now on this chapter and now on that verse, and shouts, "pure and very history;" as, for example, with Genesis xiv. He knows that the Pentateuch and the Gospels exhibit successive strata of composition, and passed from hand to hand before they took their present shape; nay, he can discriminate the strata as keenly as geologist the formations of the rock, and mark the change of hand in paragraphs, verses,

and phrases. There is undoubtedly a critical faculty of this sort, and who can limit its possible perfection?[1]

The idea which lies at the foundation of Ewald's work is, that the narratives of Scripture are not history, but that history looks through them. A great personality, like that of Abraham and Jacob, made an indelible impression, and took captive the minds of men; but in proportion as the actual circumstances of their lives were forgotten, the imagination clothed their image in some adequate historical form. A great action or event leaves an imperishable recollection, and the imagination glorifies it, till, for example, the war in Egypt becomes a procession of miracles, the giving of the law a visible descent of God, the sustenance of the nation in its wanderings a story of bread from heaven and water from the rock. More and more the earthly, the imperfect, is forgotten, and the pure idea, the ideal glory, the eternal truth wrapt up in an incident or series of incidents, alone remain, and the narrative assumes a form of etherial beauty and grace, as in the history of Joseph. An idea, a feeling, weaves for itself a historical dress, as, for example, where the repugnance of Israel to Moab and Ammon expressed itself in the story of Lot and his daughters, or when the impression of Christ's uniqueness and sinlessness clothed itself in the narrative of His conception by a virgin. So it comes to pass, that the veritable history—actually "what happened"—is found more faithfully in the Psalms, Prophetic books, and Epistles, than in the professed histories, for they are productions of the hour, not reproductions of a vanished hour. The histories of the Bible are therefore traditions, with a kernel and background of historical truth, which have passed through the glorifying (*vergeistigend*) process of time, imagination, and religious idealism. Nor can they possibly be anything else, unless we suppose—what is absurd—that miracles, theophanies, and angels are facts, and that there has been a supernatural influence exercised upon the mind and memory of man,—insane suppositions of what Ewald names "die falsche Heuchelei der

[1] It is only just to notice here, that Ewald's work is disfigured by a spirit of most audacious arrogance. We hear him constantly asserting, "I am, and none else beside me."—*e.g.* that sentence, "Men such as Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, and Keil, stand beneath and outside of all science" (unten und ausser aller Wissenschaft).

Unwissenshaftlichkeit," which may be translated, "the falseness and hypocrisy of the barbarians." This is the only view of the sacred writings which can justify itself to science.

8. The theory which has been thus rudely sketched, is no solitary phenomenon of our age. It does not materially differ from De Wette's and Hase's.[1] Probably the theory of the author of Ecce Homo, is substantially the same. Ewald is outdone by others, and viewed as still in the bondage of tradition and "Unwissenchaftlichkeit," by many of his compeers, by Spinozists, Hegelians, and Positivists, who loudly beckon him to follow them. But there are reasons for believing that he will exercise on the next generation a unique and very profound influence, and will be heard when many fail to obtain a hearing. His immense erudition, the glow of enthusiasm which pervades his volumes, fusing the masses of his learning into the witchery of romance, the finished symmetry of his theory, the great wealth of positive truth which it retains,—retaining, as many will say, all that is necessary for religious life, not to mention the almost sublime certainty of conviction with which he speaks, will all conspire to win acceptance. The modern mind is clearly in such a condition, that thousands will welcome Ewald's voice as that of a prophet, and feel that he has articulately uttered the words for which they waited. The soil is prepared for him. His work wonderfully falls in with many of the most powerful tendencies of modern thought. It will be recognised as a daring and brilliant application of the modern historical method, and illustration of the marvellous results of its pregnant touch. There are thousands who cannot part from Christ and Christianity, but labour under an invincible repugnance to the supernaturalism of evangelicalism, who feel that their head and heart have parted company, who owning themselves "heathens in the head and Christians in the heart,"—and these will welcome Ewald as one who points them the way to an inward unity and self-reconciliation. While so many things promise success, we cannot ignore the fact, that the Evangelical Church is in many respects unprepared worthily to answer for itself and repel the foe, while the time has passed for declamations and the vociferations of ignorance.

[1] De Wette's "Biblische Dogmatik;" Hase's "Leben Jesu;" Hase's "Dogmatik: Christus in der Geschichte,—Christus im Gemuth,—Christus in der Kirche."

The adequate learning is wanting in many quarters. A sufficiently profound religious life is wanting. There is want of consolidation in the Evangelical ranks. Nay, within the Evangelical Church there are active tendencies already in league with the enemy, tendencies which a little rigorous logic (*Folgerichtigkeit*), will speedily develope to Ewaldism. An example may be found in the indefinite character of prevailing views on the nature of the Inspiration of the Scriptures. There are those, perhaps, who maintain an infallible book and an infallible text,—those who maintain only one originally infallible book and text,—those who surrender the idea of unerring accuracy in names, and numbers, and subordinate details,—those who extend this reserve further and further, in gradually widening circles, and retain at last, only infallibility of moral and religious truth,—those who boldly say the Bible is not, but *contains*, the Word of God, and so on; gravitating downwards till they reach a position which Ewald would accept. Another example may be found in the unsettled state of opinion on the nature of the Atonement. There are those who maintain the commercial or huckster theory of the Atonement; those who say that the sufferings of Christ were a satisfaction to vindictive justice, as a necessary attribute of God; that they were a compensation to the outraged honour of God; that they were rendered necessary by an emergency in the Divine government; that they were a dramatic representation to the universe of the purity of God's law; that they were an exhausting of the curse of the world in a historical process, a bearing of sin in an internal sympathy with its misery,—the ethical theory, in endless modifications, retaining as long as possible the idea of satisfaction, till at last it vanishes; and, finally, those who say that divine righteousness demands only the destruction of sin, and that the cross of Christ satisfies it, because it is a moral force to expel sin from the heart and universe,—to which Ewald would give unqualified assent. When it has once come to this, the mind awakes to discover that the idea of the proper divinity of Christ is altogether superfluous, and that the Christ whom Ewald depicts is adequate to our needs. We might therefore well be induced to fear that the age will fall an easy prey into the hands of Ewald.

But, on the other hand, one may boldly affirm that the

triumph of Ewald's theory, and its general acceptance by Christendom, is a thing incredible and impossible. The Evangelical Church feels itself greater than Ewald, recognising that there is not a single important element of positive truth in his theory, which is not already included in its belief, and that it rejects only his negations. Nothing is fitted so quickly to sap the foundations of our belief in Christianity as eternal truth, and in Christ as Heaven's crowning boon to the race, as to hear it said, that from the hour in which Christ disappeared, having finished His work, the Church commenced to run a career of the most wild and extravagant error, and must now proceed to undo the work of ages. We might be prepared to learn that the Church had hitherto erred by defect, and had not yet sufficiently appropriated its own treasures; but to hear that its errors have been all errors by excess, imagining God's words and works more magnificent than they really were, and Christ too great and glorious, startles the mind, and awakes revulsion. As we ponder Ewald's plausible and fascinating theory, there comes over the mind a feeling, that it somehow has wrapt up within it all the superficial and plausible errors in regard to the nature of God and His relation to the world, human nature and man's sin and Heaven's remedy, with which in ages past the Church grappled victoriously. We cannot imagine that the promise of the Holy Ghost to guide the Church into all truth, can have been so awfully belied, and our heart answers back, while yet our intellect is stunned: "We cannot thus part company with the apostles, the fathers, the confessions of all Christendom, the utterance of the universal Christian consciousness." There is no use of saying, that it is only a completion of the Reformation, or a second Reformation. There is no parallel between what Luther did and what is now proposed. It is utter destruction of the past, and entire revolution. The beliefs now threatened have so grown together with Christendom, that before ever Ewald's theory can ever be dominant, the existing Church of Christ must be swept away as with the waters of a deluge.

9. Ewald's work imposes a serious and very arduous task upon biblical criticism, shewing, as it does, how the highest questions of doctrinal truth are inseparably connected with its inquiries and conclusions. Biblical criticism has been too much esteemed among us a hewer of wood and a drawer of

water. Its place is that of a son in the house; for it is apparent, that even so momentous a question as that of the person of Christ is inseparably connected with it; that if the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch cannot be maintained and the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels defended against all comers, the proper divinity of Christ will also have to be surrendered, and Christ henceforth counted only the perfect man, or probably only the least imperfect hitherto. We naturally desire to keep such a question apart from questions concerning MSS. and dates and philology; but it cannot be. Darwin has shewn how the whole physical character of a country would be changed by the absence of some tiny insect; how its absence would affect some higher forms of animal and vegetable life, higher and higher, till even the existence of man was threatened; so it will be found that any radical change in the conclusions of biblical critics, will influence the whole of religious thought, and necessitate a reconstruction of the higher beliefs. Let biblical criticism then to its task, and let us tolerantly give it room. Meanwhile we do not seem to have much to fear. We can meet Ewald confidently with a verdict of "not proven." His peculiar opinions are accepted by very few, even of his own countrymen, and his theory of the composition of the Old Testament books is regarded as in the highest degree arbitrary. The views of those who reject the traditional opinion are legion. We may rest till their self-contradictions are hushed, and meanwhile leave them alone, as we do the biologists. The objections, on the other hand, urged against the inherited views do not seem very formidable, and seem to press lightly on the minds of thoroughly competent scholars; while the external and internal evidences in their favour are such as to shield us with strong battlements. For example, Ewald's view of the origin of Genesis and Exodus seems a sheer impossibility, in the face of the minutely accurate personal knowledge of the usages of Egypt, its laws, religion, character, and climate, which everywhere appears in the most artless manner. But whether the traditional opinions can be maintained or not, it is plain that such views as those of Ewald concerning the nature of the biblical narrative, can never commend themselves to the popular mind,—meaning by that, sound and vigorous common sense. It will quickly answer

him by saying, He makes the sacred writers no better than fools and liars, drivellers and forgers of pious frauds. Did they, or did they not, suppose themselves to be writing history and narrating facts? If they knew that the truth of the matter was as Ewald represents, then they were gross impostors, —impostors, verily, of a strange sort; for who can reconcile such a supposition with the purity, guilelessness, and *naïveté*, which lend such a charm to their compositions? And if they did suppose themselves to be writing history, then they were only drivelling idiots, and upon them falls the charge of the "falsche Heuchelei der Unwissenchaftlichkeit." Nor can we shelter ourselves from the horns of this dilemma, by saying, It was a primitive age, to which we must not transfer our historical sense; for Ewald supposes the sacred writings to be the work of the sublimest spirits of an age of highest culture. If we could thus shield the writers of the Old Testament, what of the writers of the Gospels, who speak as eye-witnesses? If John was simply, as De Wette says, a "Geistes-trunkener," or, as Ewald says, like a musician who, having caught a melodious strain, draws it out and rings changes upon it till it becomes a flowing symphony, then he has perpetrated a most audacious falsehood in the name of the Holy One.

10. Nothing could possibly be more suicidal than Ewald's treatment of the question of miracles. He is in the unhappy position of one who can neither altogether accept them nor absolutely reject them; and lays himself open to attacks from before and from behind. On the one hand, he cherishes a deep repugnance to the idea of miracles, starts back from them as if scared, and resolutely explains them away; but, on the other hand,—and this is most apparent in his treatment of the Gospels,—he has too fine and truthful a historical instinct, and too profound a sense of the glory of Christ, to endeavour to reduce even the wonderful to the common. His idea of a dynamic power, latent in spirit, potentialised in Christ to the highest possible degree, which can accomplish what transcends the normal limits of man's power, may have in it a kernel of truth. Nay, it probably contains a great and sublime truth,— the truth which will be fully revealed in the glorified body and in the spiritualised heavens and earth. But if this idea be true, would it not be sufficient to conduct him to an unqualified recognition of all the miracles as literal facts? For into what,

after all, does the idea of the miracle resolve itself but this—that all the laws and forces of nature are the expression of the will of the eternal Spirit who fills the universe, whose breathing is its life, and for whom all nature is a veil and garment; that as man's spirit can enter in among the forces of matter, and mould and bend them, so the eternal Spirit, into the energy of whose will all forces are to be resolved, can in a moment so direct the currents of His will, that a new phenomenon shall start into being, and that the natural world is not a granite wall defying God and man, but a plastic substance,—nay, a spiritual living thing, born of the eternal Word, and having an ear to hear God's voice. But Ewald refuses to carry his own idea to its legitimate length. It is truly pitiable to hear him explaining away the miracle of Cana of Galilee, with the trite remark, "Christ's spirit at all times turns our water into wine;" and that of the feeding of the multitude with the remark, "The true faith and love despair least where the want is greatest, and in joyful giving and receiving convert want into superfluity;" and at the same time, gliding over the narratives in a manner so saponaceous, that one can scarcely tell whether he affirms or denies the miracle. What can he expect but, on the one hand, to awake sorrow in the hearts of all who adore Christ, as he himself also does, and, on the other hand, to be greeted with the jeers of those who have advanced to an unqualified rejection of the miraculous in every shape and in every degree? We only add here, that the untenableness of Ewald's whole position in regard to the miracles, is most apparent in his treatment of the resurrection of Christ. The whole question of the miraculous may be staked on the point, Was that a literal historical fact? Is there anything in all history, established by a greater weight of evidence? Can we be expected for a moment to believe, that when the apostles speak of Christ's resurrection, they meant it in Ewald's sense? Were they raving, and did they not know the meaning of words? And if that was a fact, all the miracles are facts. Ewald's narrative betrays his sense of a vast difficulty here. Who, *e.g.*, can reconcile these expressions: "Nothing is more firmly established historically, than that Christ rose from the dead and appeared to His disciples." . . . . "This condition of ecstacy through the vision of the risen one), however nearly

it may border on sensible experience, was purely spiritual" (vi. 69, 76). With the first of these sentences, Ewald overturns his whole theory; with the second he shews how slippery the ground is on which he treads.

11. We approach a still more momentous question, when we proceed to consider Ewald's view of the person of Christ. In the most unqualified manner, he rejects the doctrine of His pre-existence and proper divinity, the incarnation and miraculous conception. "Never did Jesus as the Son and Word of God, confound Himself or presumptuously put Himself on the same level with the Father and God" (v. 498). He reproaches the churches with making of Christ "an idol, who will forgive their sins if they feign before Him with vain words" (vol. v. Vovrede). In what sense he understands the expressions commonly supposed to express His divinity and habitually used as such, we have already shewn (p. 114), attaching to them only an ethical or ideal meaning, and denying to them any metaphysical and ontological background. Christ was simply the culminating production of humanity in its religious development, for every tendency of human nature works onwards irresistibly, till one appear who perfectly embodies it. Christ was literally son of Joseph and Mary, probably from one side descended from Judah, and on the other side from Levi, distinguished from other men only by sinlessness, and as such, purest expression of the true religion, and of humanity according to its architype (Urbild), of God also in whose image man was made, and therefore King of Israel, Lord of the kingdom of heaven, leader and commander of humanity, eternal light and Saviour, verily "the way, the truth, and the life," and "the first-born among many brethren." We can well understand what a charm Ewald's theory must possess for the higher Unitarianism of our day, as represented by men like Martineau, and how eagerly they make haste to make his works familiar. We allow they could not well desire a nobler champion for their cause. Any one simply hearing Ewald's view from its positive side, might depart fully satisfied; he would hear all the great expressions used in good faith and in fervour; but we cannot tell a man's real belief simply from the phrases he employs, nor establish doctrines by simply quoting texts.

Here again we have an example of the unhappiness of any man who tries to occupy a middle position, laying himself open

to attack from before and from behind. Ewald must advance or he must retreat,—Christ is less than the perfect man, or more.

"Distinguished only by His sinlessness." But how do we know the fact of His sinlessness? From the impression which His whole self-revelation makes upon our souls, awaking on the one hand a perfect consciousness of sin, and on the other hand a quenchless aspiration to attain that ideal of holiness and blessedness which we behold in Him. But there are those—such as F. W. Newman and Theodore Parker—who avow that Christ makes upon their souls no such impression of unique and transcendent moral perfection; and what answer would Ewald give to them but this: "You have not seen and known Him enough,—*my* Christian consciousness gives a totally different verdict on the value of Christ's self-revelation." What manner of answer then will he himself give to the witness of the Christian consciousness of centuries, when it rises up and says to him, "*You* have not seen and known Him enough,—we cannot rest but in a much higher answer to the meaning of Christ's self-manifestation." Will the question thus resolve itself into one of religious life and experience? Must the true and final answer be given by a profounder and intensified religious feeling?[1]

"Distinguished only by His sinlessness." But here is a vast

[1] In the above paragraph, we have twice permitted ourselves to use the expression "Christian consciousness." It is time the expression were fairly accepted and naturalised, for it compactly expresses a fact for which we have no equally pointed word. The expression is Schleiermacher's, but the idea of the word is as old as Christianity. It is no more mystical than these words of Scripture: "He that believeth hath the witness in himself;" "The sheep follow Him for they know His voice, and a stranger will they not follow." Owen has expressed the idea as nearly as possible in these words: "There is a great answerableness and correspondency between the heart of a believer and the truth that he doth believe. As the word is in the Gospel, so is grace in the heart; yea, they are the same thing variously expressed. . . . . The doctrine of the Gospel begets the form, figure, image, or likeness of itself in the hearts of them that believe; so they are cast into the mould of it. The principle of grace in the heart and that in the word, are as children of the same parent, completely resembling and representing one another. Grace is a living word, and the word is figured, limned grace; as is regeneration, so is a regenerate heart; as is the doctrine of faith, so is a believer,—*such a soul can produce a duplicate of the word and so adjust all things thereby.*" (On the 130th Psalm, ver. 4.) Reckless charges of mysticism and such like, are sometimes found striking nearer home than those who make them are aware of.

and overwhelming difficulty, for which Ewald has no solution. How came Jesus of Nazareth to be sinless, the only sinless one, and as such, above all men as heaven is above the earth? If it be said there is no greater mystery in this moral originality than in original genius in any other department; if He is sinless only as having reached the goal towards which humanity aspires unceasingly, then we have exhibited to us a conception of the nature of sin, which the Christian heart will reject even with strong reprobation; for sin is then regarded only as a creaturely limitation, as imperfection, and the very pith and marrow are extracted from our thoughts concerning its inherent badness and guilt. If it were said that Christ *became* sinless by a moral process, disentangling Himself from the meshes of the world's ungodliness, the difficulty would be less considerable; but the unique and incomparable thing in Christ is, that He did not become, but is sinless from the beginning, that in Him is no trace of a moral struggle to overcome inward contradictions, and that He alone knows nothing of moral wretchedness, of repentance, and confession, and regret, and has no need of pardon or grace. It is therefore impossible to regard Him as a link in the chain of humanity. He is infinitely different from all men. Those who are likest Him and nearest Him, feel His moral distance to be the greatest; and the mind cannot rest satisfied till it has found an explanation of His person, which conserves at once the sense of His absolute similarity to man, and transcendant superiority,—till it has reached the idea of the Godman, in the supernatural and metaphysical sense, and cried, My Lord and my God!

"Distinguished only by His sinlessness." But on Ewald's basis it is a sheer impossibility to hold fast any longer our conviction of His sinlessness. It will be admitted that we cannot think of moral perfection, without associating with it as its complement the idea of perfect moral and religious light; as Ullmann has said, "To the spotless purity of His spirit and conduct, corresponded the truth, depth, and certainty of His knowledge of human and divine things." Our minds refuse to recognise sinlessness when we are confronted with prejudices, errors, delusions, and confusions of thought, in matters which do not require learning, but only moral insight and pure sympathy with God and man. But what then of Jesus of

Nazareth? Alas! Ewald could have taught Him. He verily believed in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; in the Divine inspiration of the Old Testament, which He habitually used in that very manner for which we are called benighted; nay, He believed with all His heart and mind, in theophanies, miracles, angels, and Satan,—things which Ewald sees to be quite unbecoming in the universe, and which his more sublime conception of God necessitates his moral sense to exclude. And if Jesus, in such points, was only accommodating Himself to the prejudices and limitations of His day, He was guilty of a grave moral offence, and acted in a manner unworthy of one who felt that He was making His appeal, not to a day, but to the limitless future.

No; Ewald predicates of Christ either too much or too little. Either He was only a Jewish Rabbi, who made a profound impression on His disciples by His wisdom and sanctity,—and then we shake hands with Strauss and Renan; or He was what the Christian Church has all these ages declared Him to be,—Incarnate God.

12. It is scarcely necessary at any length, to notice Ewald's conception of the work of Christ, as it really forms an integral part of his conception of Christ's person. He does not regard Him as in any proper sense a Saviour; not in the sense of procuring redemption, or alone making a life in communion with God possible to sinful man. Man could always attain the true religion without Him, only not perfectly. He is king in the kingdom of the true religion, and His whole self-revelation is an infinite and inexhaustible force to raise all who yield to it to moral perfection and everlasting blessedness. Holding such a view, it is still quite possible habitually to use most of the biblical and ecclesiastical language concerning redemption, to call Christ Saviour and Mediator, to find in His cross the meaning of the Old Testament ritual, to speak of His blood as cleansing from sin and of Himself as ransom and sinbearer,—in short, to propound an ethical view of the Atonement as good as that of many who profess belief in the Athanasian Creed. Nevertheless it is all non-natural language, and an emasculated doctrine; and the Church will refuse to own it as reflecting its sense of redemption, or as a true reproduction of apostolical experience as mirrored in the Epistles.

It is most important to make this last idea prominent. To

ask us to accept Ewald's theory, is to ask us to consent to a breach with the apostles; but to such a breach, Ewald's whole theory hinders him from yielding his consent. He holds that the apostolic band was a body so filled with the pure image of Christ, that from them it should propagate itself from age to age, till at last it shone from the face of a transfigured humanity, —for him, a suicidal admission. Does he not, therefore, accept the orthodox position, that the apostles are normal law for all the ages of Christianity,—that in all ages the Church has to regulate its conceptions by the apostolic mind, and to look into the New Testament to behold the ideal of life, conduct, thought, and piety to which it is to be conformed, for ever distrusting itself when it finds itself either behind or in advance of what is written? Every true Christian feels the New Testament to be beyond him, feels that every advance in the knowledge of God and of Christ is an approximation to that bright standard of the life which is hidden with God in Christ, and feels himself poor in comparison with its great thoughts and sublime emotions. But if Ewald be right, then the apostles were still under the weak and beggarly elements, unenlightened and carnal, while we are wise and spiritual. No faithful reproduction of apostolic doctrine will ever embody Ewaldism. It will be for ever found a vain task to produce a persuasion that Paul and John did not believe in the proper divinity of Christ, in His pre-existence, miraculous conception, incarnation, and resurrection, in the same literal and natural sense in which we now affirm them. Rationalism and Unitarianism have in most quarters given up the attempt to find themselves in John's Gospel and the Epistle to the Romans. It has plainly come to this,—either to accept the Evangelical creed in its substantial features, as embodied in all the Reformation standards, or with it also to resign all claim to the true "apostolical succession." Ewald must advance or retreat; there is no standing-ground in his present position, if the apostles have falsely reproduced Christ and His redemption.

13. We have adduced reasons enough to justify our refusal to become Ewald's disciples; shewn sufficiently what insuperable difficulties still lie in our way. It were enough to induce us to remain standing, that we see in the theory presented to us no finality,—that, by inevitable steps, it conducts further,

to pure Deism, or to Spinozism, nay, to Positivism,—nay, to Darwinism. We are well aware, however, that the difficulty just lies here. Many see clearly enough, that if once they leave their moorings, they plunge into a bottomless abyss, and therefore remain. But they are still unhappy, and feel as if some strong force were impelling them away. The central difficulty scarcely admits of being reasoned with; it is a deep-rooted repugnance to the idea of the supernatural, not a repugnance directly based on arguments, but a kind of moral creation of innumerable currents of influence coming from many quarters, which is so fixed in thousands of minds, that the Old Testament narratives awake up a sense of the ridiculous, and seem as incredible as stories of ghosts and witches. It is *the* characteristic of our age and time; and one of our deepest wants is an influence to counteract it. Ought we not to look for help to the higher mental philosophy? May it not be that Locke, and Reid, and Mill, have been tyrannizing over modern thought? What if the truth should be found yet in some form of philosophical idealism? Or, seeing that the repugnance to admit the supernatural is to a large extent a creation of our abundant wealth and physical wellbeing, our material progress and our commerce,—what if we need some awful baptism of blood and sorrow to loosen our grasp of material things, and compel us to own that man is spirit, and that Jehovah is greater than mighty ocean billows? Meanwhile the tendency is there, and erelong it will not only count it ridiculous to believe in Balaam's speaking ass, and in the water which issued from the jaw-bone which Samson found, but also find it as much the mark of a weak mind to believe in God and in prayer, as to believe in the mediæval legends.

We shall now conclude this paper, by indicating the services rendered by these volumes, in making clear what are the pending theological issues, and what questions are most urgently demanding consideration. (1.) Not undeserving of notice, first of all, is the powerful manner in which they protest against the one-sided abstract theological tendency, and recall theology to the historical basis on which it rests. Christian truth comes to us, not as scholastic abstractions, but as the life-breath of a history. Only by the Gospel history can we approach our highest conceptions of Christ: the historical Jesus is the bridge leading to the theological Christ. But

from many quarters attention is being called to this point. (2.) Ewald makes it clear that the key of the position in the present war between Evangelicalism and Rationalism, is the historical veracity of the Old Testament, and in special manner of the Pentateuch. Everything is lost if that must be surrendered. (3.) He makes it also manifest that these two questions, What is the Bible? and, Who was Christ? are inseparably linked together, and that the answer given to the former must determine the answer given to the latter. (4.) His hand has therefore completely torn asunder the thin veil which now separates Rationalists from Unitarians, shewn where a few steps of consecutive reasoning will land the former, and how illogical is the position of those who have surrendered the proper divine inspiration of the Scriptures, and still repeat the Athanasian creed. (5.) He has shewn, therefore, that the question of questions for the hour is, What is the Bible? and that no one can render a greater service than by more thoroughly grounding the doctrine of divine inspiration, and confirming the tottering faith of the Churches in the truth and divinity of the Bible contents. It is amazing to what an extent belief in the divine origin of the Scriptures is at this hour a mere tradition in evangelical circles, and how few can give an intelligent answer to the question, Why do you believe the Bible to be the Word of God.[1]

We part from Ewald with strangely mingled feelings,—with such feelings as a son may be supposed to have towards a father, whose sins and errors he cannot ignore, and whom he yet tenderly reverences and loves. There is in his volumes such earnest truthfulness, such noble courage and fearlessness, such fervent piety and moral enthusiasm, such a sustained recognition of inward religion as the true glory and treasure of the human soul,—aye, such adoration of Jesus Christ, that one's mind is spell-bound; and while you feel that you cannot and dare not surrender yourself, you cannot but wonder, admire, and reverence. We know that most of us live far beneath our great and sublime beliefs, and that they are often

[1] On a point of so much importance, we may be excused for calling attention to two works, "The Reason of Faith," by John Owen; "Einleitung in das System der Christlichen Lehre," von J. T. Beck. Beck's German is untranslateable, but his ideas might be reproduced.

rather a beautiful remote vision than an inward light and power; but there are fervent natures that inwardly appropriate every element of positive truth which they hold, whose souls refuse to allow as truth that to which they are unable to give a place in their spirit's life, and who are often greater and better than their formal beliefs. Such a one is Heinrich Ewald; and of such it is written, "To him that hath shall more be given, and he shall have abundance."

WILLIAM SALMOND.

---

## ART. VI.—*The Theology of "Culture."*[1]

IN the volume before us we are presented with the full and perfect gospel of the apostle of "Culture." He has given us his candid opinion on what may be called the essential points of religion. He professes to go to the very root of the matter, to shirk no difficulty, to leave no important problem unexamined or unsolved; to clear away the superstitions, the misbeliefs and prejudice of ages, and to reveal the real religious influence which underlie all these, and which men have felt and obeyed—however blindly and imperfectly—through these and notwithstanding them. This last enterprise of Mr Arnold is, therefore, it will be seen, a larger, bolder, and more difficult and hazardous operation than any he has previously attempted. Formerly he contented himself with light skirmishing. He conducted a sort of guerilla warfare on received opinions, but he never engaged in pitched battle. He made brilliant assaults here and there, but never allowed us a full view of his forces, and retired quickly into invisibility.

His first attack on the religious truth commonly defended by Christians, was a mere feint, and may be said to have ended in nothing. He confronted the upholders of Bible religion with "Culture," or "Hellenism," a power he said, equally important, equally divine; and, he hinted, destined to conquer and control religion, and make it fight a willing soldier under its banner; but at that time he contented him-

[1] Literature and Dogma. By Matthew Arnold, D.C.L.

self with a few long shots, and kept always at a safe distance from his enemy. In "St Paul and Protestantism," he made a greater display of force, and advanced somewhat nearer, but seemed to be only gradually feeling his way, and testing the strength of the opposing forces. The number and position of his troops, and his own skill as a leader, doubtless determined these preliminary movements, and might be approximately inferred from them—but only approximately. In discussing the religion of St Paul, for example, it might be thought that he would enter into some consideration of the nature and origin of the Christian religion, but he carefully avoided this; we have glimpses of his opinions on this subject, but only glimpses, never a full and definite view. His conception of the character, teaching, and work of Christ, is of course visible in his delineation of the Christianity of Paul, and it owes to it its prevailing colour; but in the picture Paul occupies the foreground. Christ is in shadow, and His features are indicated with that vague and general touch by which a distant object is appropriately suggested. To some extent it may be granted that such a method of treatment was a necessity; that in a consideration of Paul's theology, many things regarding Christianity must be taken for granted, much indicated only in general outline; but the question is, Whether it is right, or indeed possible, to discuss the belief of Paul, without some previous understanding, grounded on clear and definite statement, as to the facts of Christianity and the teaching of Christ? No one can have read Mr Arnold's book on St Paul, without coming to the conclusion that it ought to have been written *after* one similar to that now published. He, so to speak, retained the key to it in his own possession. No one could properly understand its meaning but himself, for no one but himself definitely knew the conception of Christianity which underlay it. This indeed constituted both its strength and its weakness; its strength, for it was impossible to refute mere hints and inuendoes; its weakness, for conclusions whose premises are known only to the inner consciousness of the writer, however they may bewilder and tantalise, can scarcely be said to edify either in a good or bad sense.

It may be admitted, however, that against the book before us it cannot be justly charged that there are premises con-

cealed, although some conclusions from its premises are only partially stated, or passed over in silence. It professes to be a bold and undisguised statement of what the writer believes to be "the truth on religious matters," and generally it is so. It supplies the key to unlock the mysteries of the former volume. It begins at the beginning, and discusses, with more or less fulness, the principal problems of religion, especially of Christianity. It may indeed be questioned, whether its deliverances altogether correspond with former ones of the same author; or to adopt again the military figure, whether in consideration of the forces he is now seen to have at command, and his present plan of attack, his former movements were not rash and hazardous; but that the sequel must determine.

The present volume, then, is an undisguised assault on all Biblical theology, of whatever Church or sect, and of whatever degree or shade of orthodoxy. He says, "The Churches cannot even conceive the Bible without the gloss they at present put upon it, and this gloss as certainly cannot possibly live. And it is not the gloss which one Church or sect puts upon the Bible and another does not; it is the gloss they all put upon it, and call the substratum of belief common to all Christian Churches, and largely shared with them even by natural religion. It is this so-called axiomatic basis which must go, and it supports all the rest" (p. ix.). According to Mr Arnold, the great cause of the rejection of the Bible, especially by many of the more intelligent of the working classes, is this "theological gloss," and his present volume is an attempt, by shewing that this theological gloss is false, without any sanction from the Bible if properly interpreted, to re-enthrone the Bible, or restore it to its old position as the great inspirer of religion. The axiomatic basis, the "assumption with which Churches and sects set out," of the personality of God, says Mr Arnold, can never be "verified;" and because it cannot be verified, because they cannot get plain experimental proof of God's personal existence, and because they have been told that the Bible assumes this, many of the working classes "pitch the whole Bible to the winds." Their manner of life, and especially the scientific influences of the times, has taught them to be intensely practical, and to ask for a rigid demonstration, or an experimental and tangible proof, of every

doctrinal statement. It has, moreover, made it impossible for them to receive that interpretation of the Bible which, according to Mr Arnold, has its sole origin in the so-called axiomatic basis of a personal God. Such doctrines as the incarnation, the atonement, prophecy, miracles, and the resurrection of Christ, are incredible to them; and, therefore, believing that to accept the Bible is to accept all its statements on these points, they reject it, and go instead to Mr Bradlaugh! It is perhaps allowable to ask, whether they receive from him a "more sure word of prophecy?" The truth is, that the amount of sincere scepticism, sincere rejection of the Bible, prevailing among the working classes is very much exaggerated. Their scientific objections to it are generally of the nature of an after thought, and form the excuse rather than the reason for their rejection of it. Of intelligent scepticism, the scepticism not of conceit, but of intelligent understanding of the points at issue, there is comparatively little. There is, indeed, a wide-spread practical infidelity, an infidelity which "believes and trembles," which has "faith," but has not "works;" but for such an infidelity Mr Arnold's book is not likely to be the panacea. If this infidelity is traceable in a measure to the imperfections of the surrounding Christianity, it is to its moral rather than its intellectual imperfections. Practical Christianity is now a much more difficult thing than it ever was at any previous period of the world's history. The relationships of society have become so complicated, the good and evil influences are so mingled and interlaced, that in the press it is sometimes difficult to distinguish them, Besides this, the increase of the world's wealth has materialised (as Mr Arnold has elsewhere graphically, but with poetical exaggeration, described) the thoughts and ideas of many, and made it impossible for them properly to appreciate the sublimity and grandeur of spiritual truth. The progress of civilisation has developed new influences, new social relations, new modes of life, new phases of thought, new forms of evil; and Christianity has not yet had time to conquer and guide these new energies. Then we are afraid that much of the imperfection of the working classes, is directly traceable to the imperfections of the Church of England. It is in an especial way the Church of the aristocracy. It has an aristocratic constitution, it has chiefly aristocratic priests, and its forms of worship are adapted

specially for aristocratic taste. Its ritual, with all its beauty, is too flowing and colourless to impress rude and earnest minds. Its preaching, where it is not the smooth and listless repetition of well-turned but vapid periods, is often too scholarly and academical to interest plain unlettered people. Methodism was an attempt to provide specially for the common people that spiritual bread which they could not obtain from the Church; and Methodism has done much, but is it wonderful that it could not do all? that many, by the mere power of "use and wont," should remain within the Church's pale, connected with it by tradition and authority, but not by knowledge and religious principle, and therefore in that state of spiritual destitution which exactly fitted them for falling an easy prey to the blandishments of Mr Bradlaugh? Their enmity to religion is but one manifestation of their republican principles. When they broke connection with the aristocracy, they broke connection with the Church; when they became jealous of aristocratic, they became jealous of priestly, which in their minds was synonymous with religious, influence. The present condition of religious opinion within the Church also, doubtless, powerfully aids these natural prejudices. Amidst so much dispute and contention between its sanctioned authorities as to the essentials of religious truth, it is not to be wondered at that some, bewildered and confused, should doubt if truth is to be found at least within the Church. Nor can it be denied that some churchmen, by the apparent sacrifice of truth to the advantages of money and position, have placed stumbling-blocks in the way of Christianity; and that the scandals connected with the sale and the patronage of what are so appropriately called "livings," do something to support the conclusion that the Church is only a pretence for furnishing a suitable income to the younger sons of the gentry. If religion is to regain its old influence over the working classes, it will not be by such a representation as is here given of it by Mr Arnold; but much might be done towards the accomplishment of this end by the removal—whether by disestablishment, by incision of festering members, or by some kind of constitutional treatment—of the more clamant defects of the great dominant Church of the nation.

But enough as to the reasons why the Bible has lost its influence over many of the masses. What is the remedy

which the volume before us prescribes? It is of course that of "Culture." Culture, according to it, will give them correct ideas of what the Bible is. It will shew them that it is not to be confounded with the theological gloss which has been put upon it by the churches. It will enable them to "discern where they ought to rest their whole weight, and where they ought to pass lightly." It will shew them that those "precise schemes of God and a future state which are presented to them," and for which they "clearly and scornfully see the failure to give the *ground* and *authority*," are not the essential truths of the Bible; and therefore, that to reject them is so far from necessitating the rejection of the Bible, that it is the essential preliminary to a right understanding of it. Now, at the outset, it will be as well to decide whether the remedy of "Culture," however efficacious it might be, if it could be laid hold of, is obtainable by the working classes. If it belong to Utopia, however good it might be in itself, it is a waste of time to seek after it. And it would seem that culture—the amount of culture necessary to read the Bible aright, not with absolute correctness, but so correctly as to get beneath the gloss of the theologians, and to be convinced that their precise schemes of God and a future state are not an essential part of Bible religion, if it does not belong to Utopia, belongs in this world only to Mr Arnold. Indeed it must be so, for he alone —aided, he admits, by the *Zeitgeist*—has been able to reach the conclusion, that the religion of the Bible is not founded on the belief in a personal God; and no one else is qualified to judge as to the truth of his discovery, till he reach the same perfection of culture—for it is culture, and such culture as Mr Arnold possesses, and neither reason, nor testimony, nor anything else, that can decide. To draw right conclusions from the facts of the Bible, we are told a man must have "power," a "large, deep, imaginative mind," the want of which, according to Mr Arnold, prevents Dr Strauss for instance, from "dealing rightly with the reality which is still left in the New Testament, after his able application of the historic method to it." "But," continues Mr Arnold, "the quality specially needed for drawing the right conclusion from the facts, when one has got them, is best called perception, delicacy of perception. And this no one can have who is a mere specialist, who has not what we call *Culture*, in addition to the knowledge of his

particular study; and even when we have added culture to special knowledge, a good fortune, a natural tact, a perception must go with our culture, to make our criticism sure" (p. xxv.). He goes on to say, that in fineness and delicacy of perception, the German mind is deficient; that though of course less lacking among its men of genius, yet even in Goethe there is deficiency in this respect. It is possessed in a sufficient degree by the highest minds of Greece and Rome, of England, France, and Italy; but apparently no one till Mr Arnold has been fortunate enough to apply it to the Bible. Well may he say, "Difficult certainly is the right reading of the Bible, and true culture too is difficult." But how are such statements to be reconciled with the following? "And what a consolation to us, who are so perpetually being taunted with our known inaptitude for abstruse reasoning, if we can find that for this great concern of religion at any rate, abstruse reasoning does not seem to be the appointed help; and that as good or better a help may be something which is in an ordinary man's power" (p. 7). Is Mr Arnold, then, only an ordinary man after all? According to him, for the great concern of religion, the Bible is the appointed help, and it can be understood without *abstruse reasoning;* but is it more within the reach of those intelligent working men, for whose sake Mr Arnold has undertaken his present task, if *Culture* be necessary not only to understand the Bible, but even Mr Arnold, to such an extent that their prejudices against it may be removed? "How," in effect, says Mr Arnold, "even supposing your metaphysics were true, can you expect plain people to understand them?" entirely oblivious that he lays himself open to the rejoinder, "How can you expect plain people to possess that amount of culture which has enabled you to distinguish between them and the essential truth of the Bible, and not, in rejecting the former, to reject both?" But, indeed, as he proceeded with his task, the conviction seems to have been borne in upon his mind, that his mission to the working classes would have no very remarkable results; and that the "help necessary for the great concern of religion," is not now at least in an "ordinary man's power." For he says, "Very likely there will come a day when there will be less religion than even now; for the religion of the Bible is so simple and powerful, that even those who make the Bible a thaumaturgy,

get hold of it, because they read the Bible; but if men do not read the Bible, they cannot get hold of it" (p. 340).

It is therefore quite evident, that for one who believed all that Mr Arnold implies as to the rare qualities (possessed by himself), such as "power," "perception—delicacy of perception," "culture," which are necessary after the "able application of the historic method," to "deal rightly with the reality that is still left in the New Testament," it would require either the consciousness of equal endowments, or sufficient intellectual bluntness not to feel the want of them, to supply sufficient courage to venture an opinion as to the results he has achieved. It is therefore fortunate, that before giving us the conclusions which he has drawn from the facts of the Bible, he found it necessary to hazard a statement as to the nature of God; a statement on which all his after criticism depends, but which is not one of the special revelations of culture. That statement is, that God is not a person. This belief, or rather scepticism, Mr Arnold holds *in common with others*, notably with the followers of Mr Bradlaugh. The personality of God, he holds, is an assumption, and it can never be verified. Not only so, but it is an absurdity; but because it has got such a strong hold on men's minds, he finds it necessary (and here let us mark that refined sense of the fitness of things, and that perfect courtesy, that instinctive perception of, and regard for, the most sacred feelings of even the humblest, which is possessed by the select few whose minds have attained to the exquisitely delicate polish and finish which a long and wide culture alone can give) to exhibit it in as many ridiculous dresses as he can invent, such as a "non-natural man," the "man in the next street," the "elder Lord Shaftesbury," forgetting that, though persons of weak intelligence, or imperfect culture, may, as everyone must, form very inadequate conceptions of the Supreme Power of the universe, that conception may contain, in however rude a form, the substance of a very sublime truth, just as deep wisdom may be uttered in imperfect sentences and in an uncouth dialect. But in some contradiction with the statement that the conception of God's personality has its origin in a rude anthropomorphism, he represents it also as a mere metaphysical conception, as an attempt at precision where that is impossible, and as depending on certain abstract notions, such as "substance, identity, causation,

design," forgetting that these may be properly used as theological weapons, and yet that men may believe in God's personality as they believe in their own, who never heard of the existence of such ideas.

But if God be not a person, what, according to Mr Arnold, is God? The "not ourselves;" more fully, "the stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being;" and, as conceived by the Israelites, the "not ourselves which makes for righteousness," or the "eternal power which makes for righteousness." From the satisfaction which inevitably follows a certain course of conduct, we come to believe in a law outside of us which has determined thus. We know nothing of this power, so says Mr Arnold, except that it is not ourselves; we can predicate nothing regarding its essential nature. If we personify it, we can do so only poetically, not in the language of sober truth. But he omits to consider, that if we are to conceive of this "not-ourselves" at all, —that is, if we are not to regard it as nothing,—we must conceive of it not only poetically, but really and with scientific precision, in some form, and in one of two forms; that is, either as spirit or matter, either as living and intelligent or as blind and dead; and neither Mr Arnold nor the followers of Mr Bradlaugh have been able to escape thinking of God in one of these forms. Mr Arnold has not; although in some places he barely escapes speaking of God as nothing,—as where he says, "the impulse in man to seek after God" is not distinguishable from "the impulse to seek his own perfection," which is very like saying that God is man's own perfection. He escapes somewhat from this, however, when he speaks of our consciousness of a "not-ourselves" which has fixed the law of our being; to which much of our conduct belongs; which is in us, and the world around us; but only to fall into the error of personifying this power, as when he says, "The grandeur of the spectacle given by the world, the grandeur of the sense of its all being *not ourselves*, being above and beyond ourselves, and immeasurably dwarfing us, a man of imagination instinctively personifies as a single mighty living and productive power" (p. 34). And: "God is a father, because the power in and around us which makes for righteousness, is indeed best described by the name of this authoritative, but yet tender and protecting relation" (p. 35).

Why "best described," unless there be in some sense tenderness in this power, and how can we conceive of tenderness except as in a person? Mr Arnold indeed says that the personifying mode of expression, though more "proper and adequate," is not so "scientifically exact," but to illustrate this he adopts rather unlucky examples. He says, "Wordsworth calls the earth 'the mighty mother of mankind,' and the geographers call her an 'oblate spheroid.' Wordsworth's expression is more proper and adequate to convey what men feel about the earth, but it is not therefore more scientifically exact" (note, p. 42). Mr Arnold, we presume, will admit that Wordsworth's expression is not so proper and adequate to convey what men feel about the earth, as the expression "Father" is proper and adequate to convey what men feel about God. But it is in reality more scientifically correct than the expression, "oblate spheroid," for it distinguishes the earth from everything else, which the other does not, that is, not from other oblate spheroids. The expression, "oblate spheroid," is scientifically exact to convey an *abstract*, but not an *individual* idea. We could never discover the earth from this definition of it, though we might with certainty from Wordsworth's. Without more information than it conveys, we could not think of it at all. We cannot think of an oblate spheroid in the abstract, but only as composed of something; and therefore to call the earth an "oblate spheroid," is not to define it. In like manner, to call God "the stream of tendency, by which all things fulfil the law of their being," may be scientifically exact, but it is abstract. It cannot be called a scientific definition at all. Without something more it conveys to us no information. It wants substance sufficient to assume a palpable form.

But if Mr Arnold has been unable to think of God but—consciously or unconsciously—in one of two forms, neither have the followers of Mr Bradlaugh, only they have adopted the other form. They do not personify God, but that is because they do not think of Him as "a single living power." They do not say "Our Father," but that is because they do not believe in God's tender and protecting relation to them; and therefore instead of a personal God, they do homage to the blind material force of uniform law. So that Mr Arnold, by his efforts at agreement, has only made the gulf of separation

between him and them more manifest and irreconcilable. If, therefore, to think of God as a person be to think of Him as a non-natural man, not to do so is either not to think of Him at all, or to think of Him as a non-natural thing, or a non-natural *tertium quid.* But granted that we only "see as through a glass darkly," do we therefore see nothing that we can distinguish? If our words about God—as we admit—cannot describe Him adequately, if "they are only *thrown out* at a vast object which we cannot fully grasp," do we therefore grasp with them nothing but air, nothing definite and characteristic of that vast object? Granted that it is possible to be too precise, granted that we can "never find out God unto perfection," can we therefore not find out God at all? Must we then—as we are exhorted by Mr Arnold—for ever wait for His "becoming"? But is there anything metaphysically abstract, anything "non-natural" in the thought, that it is through the glass of our own spirits that we see God, however darkly? that human love may mirror, however brokenly and dimly, a pure eternal love which passes thought? that our faint and feeble knowledge may be a ray from a wisdom which is unsearchable? that our very blunders and errors may lead us to feel the necessity of leaning on an understanding which is infinite? and that our sense of sin and failure of duty may tell us of our relation to a holiness whose inaccessible glory we may feel though we cannot approach? Is it "non-natural" to think that these are emanations, however faint, from some Supreme Spirit from whom we have come, and who, as the Israelites have expressed it, "has made us in His own image?" But if God be not a Spirit, will Dr Arnold solve this problem, How is a man better than a sheep? How is man superior to the lower animals, or even to inanimate matter? for all these, we are told, "fulfil the law of their being." They obey God at least as perfectly as man, blindly, it may be, but what of that, if intelligence does not bring us any nearer to God?

Mr Arnold, then, being unable to accept what he names the "so-called axiomatic basis of a personal God," proceeds to discover that this is not the basis of the Bible. This discovery, be it observed, is all-important for his purpose. For if it could be shewn that the Israelites' belief in God's personality is coincident in its origin with their belief in the "not ourselves which makes for righteousness," not only would it be impossible

to get the Bradlaughites to use the Bible, but Mr Arnold's culture would be altogether thrown away on its interpretation; and more than this, it would be shewn that righteousness has its foundation and sanction in God's personality. It is therefore unlucky for Mr Arnold's theory, that anthropomorphism, as he says, is such a universal thing; that the individuals and the nations among whom the Bible religion arose, were surrounded on all sides by people sunk in the degraded anthropomorphism of heathenism, with its "Lords many and Gods many;" and that they themselves, on the supposition that they formed their religion by their own efforts, must have struggled up from that anthropomorphism. They could not, at first, have conceived of a "not-ourselves" without personifying it; not merely poetically, but by real application to it of human qualities, if their religion had only a natural origin and development; and therefore, by a single bound, they must have left all their old ideas behind, and leapt into the possession of a religion whose God is so impersonal and so immaterial that he cannot be said to be known at all. "Alas!" to adopt the language of our author, "these poor people" if they "were not archbishops of York," neither were they Mr Arnolds! But surely there never was such a signal illustration of the power of a theory to blind the judgment in discovering facts and drawing conclusions, as that furnished by the astonishing statement of Mr Arnold, that he can find in the early history of the Israelites no trace of a belief in a personal God. No one denies that they believed in an "eternal power which makes for righteousness," but does it follow from this that they did not believe in a personal God? He says: "At the time they produced those documents which give to the Old Testament its power and true character, the *not-ourselves* which weighed upon the mind of Israel, and engaged its awe, was the *not-ourselves* by which we get the sense for *righteousness*, and whence we find the help to *do right*. This conception was indubitably what lay at the bottom of that remarkable change which, under Moses, at a certain stage of their religious history, befell their mode of naming God; this was what they intended in that name, which we wrongly convey, either without translation by Jehovah, which gives us the notion of a mere mythological deity, or by a wrong translation *Lord*, which gives us the notion of a magnified

and non-natural man. The name they used was the Eternal" (p. 30). But he says elsewhere: "The God of Israel for popular religion" (now-a-days) "is a magnified and non-natural man who has really worked stupendous miracles, whereas the gods of the heathen were imagined to be able to work them, but could not, and had therefore no real existence" (p. 125). Now, in those very documents in which Moses gives the name Eternal to God, there are miracles recorded, and they are recorded as miracles. Moses is represented as working miracles before Pharaoh, by the power of the Eternal. Then the passage of the Red Sea, the falling down of the walls of Jericho, the staying of the sun till a battle is concluded, and other miracles which Mr Arnold, of course, discredits, are all recorded as the direct interposition of a personal God, who knew that such things were required by the circumstances of His people. Whether rightly or wrongly, the *writer of the ocuments* relates these occurrences, and he relates them as *miracles;* and if to represent God as a worker of miracles is to represent Him as a non-natural man, that writer has represented Him as a non-natural man.

But will it be believed that in his consideration of the religion of the Bible, Mr Arnold has overlooked sacrifice altogether. Now sacrifice formed the most important part of Jewish worship, not merely at one particular period of their history, but from the beginning to the end of it. The documents which name God the Eternal, contain minute directions as to its observance. It was observed as much by Jews as by heathen nations, and its observance is utterly inexplicable on the supposition that they did not believe in God's personality, that they worshipped not a really but only a poetically living God.

God, then—so culture reveals—was to the Israelites in the time of Moses only "the eternal power which makes for righteousness." They indeed spoke—they were led instinctively to do this—of this power in the language of poetry and emotion, and personified it figuratively as a living power. "But it is evident," we are told, "that this revelation lost as time went on its nearness and clearness, and that for the mass of the Hebrews their God came to be a mere magnified and non-natural man, like the God of our popular religion now, who has commanded certain courses of conduct, and attached cer-

tain sanctions to them. And though prophets and righteous men among the Hebrews might preserve always the immediate and truer apprehension of their God as the Eternal who makes for righteousness, they in vain tried to communicate this apprehension to the mass of their countrymen" (p. 81). Their difficulty was, that at that stage of the world's history conduct lay chiefly "in the line of national and social duties," which are "peculiarly capable of a mechanical exterior performance, in which the heart has no share." Therefore conduct to the Israelites came gradually to consist in outward observances, which had no influence on the heart. They thus lost the sense of joy, happiness, salvation, which "obedience to the law of righteousness" inevitably gives. They saw, moreover, that prosperity in private life often attended the sinner as much as the righteous. "In the life of nations there was the rise and power of the great unrighteous kingdoms of the heathen, the unsuccessfulness of Israel, though Israel was undoubtedly, as compared with the heathen, the depository and upholder of the idea of righteousness. Therefore prophets and righteous men also, like the unspiritual crowd, could not but look ardently to the future, to some great change and redress in store" (p. 72). Thus there sprang up what Mr Arnold calls an "Aberglaube, or extra belief," whose grandeur was that it arose from the conviction that "righteousness was an everlasting foundation," whose weakness was that its conception of righteousness was chiefly outward and material. The belief and prophecy concerning a Son of Man was but these hopes and anticipations of Israel taking shape. It was a "kind of fairy tale which a man tells himself; which no one can prove impossible to turn out true, but which no one also can prove certain to turn out true" (p. 77). It was the poetry of life, but had an inevitable tendency to become rigid and scientific—to become a definite belief, "according to which there should come about, in no distant future, a grand and wonderful change; God should send His Messiah, judge the world, punish the wicked, and restore the kingdom to Israel" (p. 185). Mr Arnold holds that the prophecies regarding Christ can in this manner be easily accounted for on natural grounds, that they admit of a "large and loose construction," and are not, in the proper sense of the term, predictions. He allows indeed that Christ applied them to Himself,

and that He fulfilled all the grandest anticipations that they contained, but in a way different from what any of the Jews expected. Now the wonderful thing is—and it is not less wonderful, less miraculous, though it is unaccountable on Mr Arnold's view of prophecy—that one should have arisen, able to say, "I am the Messiah you have longed for; and I am greater—I bring a greater salvation—than you have ever dreamed of;" that this fairy tale which the Israelites told to themselves should have proved true, and should ultimately have come to be corroborated, though in a manner infinitely above the highest flight of their imagination by actual facts. Only think what would have befallen the world if no one with the "στοιχεια" of Jesus had appeared! The wonder is increased, not lessened, by Mr Arnold's account of Christ's relation to prophecy,—increased so as to make his theory of prophecy incredible. The very fact that the fulfilment was so much higher than any one expected, rather increases the evidence of a supernatural element in prophecy. That one should have come into the world at the very time He was needed and expected, able to satisfy apparently for the whole future of the world the highest aspirations and longings of men, must give to the prophecies regarding His coming a character sufficiently wonderful to be called miraculous.

But what, according to Mr Arnold, is the exact place occupied by Christ in the history of religion? How did He fulfil the hopes and expectations of the Israelites? In what does His greatness consist? What did He do for religion or conduct to render His influence so transcendant and lasting? He restored the intuition of righteousness which had been lost, but in a higher form, indeed in a form which will last as long as the world lasts. Mr Arnold says, "Though the work of Jesus, like the name of God, calls up in the believer a multitude of emotions and associations far more than any brief definition can cover, yet remembering Jeremy Taylor's advice to avoid exhortations to get Christ, to be in Christ, and to seek some more distinct and practical way of speaking of Him, we shall not do ill, perhaps, if we summarise to our minds His work, by saying that He restored the intuition of God, through transforming the idea of righteousness, and that to do this He brought a method, and He brought a secret. And of these two great words which fill such a place in His gospel, *repentance*

and *peace*—as we see that His apostles when they preached His gospel, preached repentance unto life, and peace through Jesus Christ. Of these two great words, one, *repentance*, attaches itself, we shall find, to His method; and the other, *peace*, to His secret" (p. 192).

The "method" of Jesus was to make men look within, "to that inward world of feelings and dispositions which Judaism had too much neglected" (p. 86). "This was the 'method' of Jesus; setting up a great unceasing inward movement of attention and verification in matters which are three-fourths of human life, where to see true and to verify is not difficult, —the difficult thing is to care and to attend" (p. 195). "To work the renovation" (repentance) "needed, be concentrated His efforts upon a method of *inwardness*, of taking counsel with conscience" (p. 200). So much for the method. "But," continues Mr Arnold, "for this world of busy inward movement, created by the method of Jesus, a rule of action was wanted; and this rule was found in His secret" (p. 200). That secret was the revealing of two selves within us, a higher and a lower. "When we attend, we find that an impulse to do a thing is really in itself no reason at all why we should do it; because impulse proceeds from two sources quite different, and of quite different degrees of authority. St Paul contrasts them as the inward man, and the man in our members; the mind of the flesh, and the spiritual mind. Jesus contrasts them as *life* properly so named, and *life in this world*" (p. 20). We see that one of these ought to rule over the other; but this is mere morality. "Jesus changed it into what was positive and attractive, lighted it up, made it religion by the idea of two *lives* —one of them life properly so called, full of light, endurance, felicity, in connection with the higher and permanent self; and the other of them life improperly so called, in connection with the lower and transient self" (p. 202.) "Jesus not only *saw* this great necessary truth of there being, as Aristotle says, in human nature, a part to rule, and a part to be ruled; He saw it so thoroughly, that He saw through the suffering at its surface to the joys at its centre, filled it with promise and hope, and made it infinitely attractive" (p. 208).

This "method" and "secret" of Jesus had their power directly from Himself, from the "sweet reasonableness, the exquisite mild winning felicity, with which the renouncement,

and the inward appraisal are applied and conveyed, and the conjunction of the three in Jesus, the method of inwardness, and the secret of self-renouncement working in and through this element of mildness, produced the total impression of His 'epieikeia' or sweet reasonableness; a total impression ineffable and indescribable for the disciples, as it also was irresistible for them, but at which their descriptive words, like this '*sweet reasonableness*' and like '*full of grace and truth*,' are thrown out and aimed" (p. 215). Such is a condensed description of Mr Arnold's account of the position occupied by Christ in the religion of man. But here we may notice in parenthesis, that one of the advantages of a "literary treatment" of the Bible is, that—on account of its loose and general way of dealing with facts, its habit of "throwing out words at an object not fully grasped,"—a direct contradiction of statement is not so manifest as if it were conveyed in more definite language. Thus, when Mr Arnold states that Christ restored the intuition by revealing the *secret* of two lives, we are led to believe that up to this time Israel had never made such a discovery, but obtained what religion, what conception of, what zeal for righteousness she originally possessed, in another way. But Mr Arnold says that it is the knowledge of this secret alone, that changes morality into religion; and yet he admits that originally the Israelites had religion, and he even affirms that the "first kind of life was a cherished ideal with Israel,"—("Thou wilt shew me the path of life!" p. 202). It also seems to be one of the peculiar prerogatives of culture that it should not require to know its own mind; for Mr Arnold in one place accounts for religion becoming among the Jews mechanical and exterior, "by reason of the stage of their own growth, and the world's" necessitating that "conduct should lie chiefly in national and social duties" (p. 82); and elsewhere implies that Jesus alone, by reason of his "epieikeia," and not merely any new stage of a nation's, nor of the world's history, could change conduct from being exterior and make it permanently inward and real. This, however, is merely by the way.

It will be recollected that a somewhat similar, but less definite and full description of Christ's position in religion, is given in "St Paul and Protestantism." There, however, Mr Arnold does not in so many words deny Christ's divinity; although he hints that the usual conceptions of divinity are

mistaken ones, he seems to imply that Christ is not more than man. He says, "For us who approach Christianity through a scholastic theology, it is Christ's divinity which establishes His being without sin. For Paul, who approached Christianity through his personal experience, it was Christ's "being without sin which established His divinity" (*St Paul*, p. 63). In the present volume, however, he indirectly implies that Christ was not more than man, although he seems rather to prefer to give the question the go-by, which might perhaps be attributed to modesty, only it is almost the only thing in the book that has even the semblance of this; and besides, it may be explained on other grounds, not so flattering indeed, but not so unlikely. He admits that Christ called Himself the Son of God, but only in the sense that He was righteous; that He professed to be sent by God, but only in the sense that He gave men the secret of righteousness. He hints that it is absurd to call Him the Son of God in any other than a metaphorical sense, because God is not a person; but this is to avoid the real question, which even on Mr Arnold's hypothesis is this, Whether Christ being man, was not also more than man; whether He had not an infinitely higher relationship to the "eternal power, which makes for righteousness," than any mere man could have? And again, this fact undeniably stares Mr Arnold in the face, that Jesus was a person; and this person, this son of man, he admits was as righteous as the eternal power which makes for righteousness! "The sum and substance of the total impression produced by the contemplation of Christ on Paul, may be best conveyed by two words, *without sin*" (*St Paul*, p. 63). And again, "For attaining the righteousness of God, for reaching an absolute conformity with the moral order, and with God's will, he saw no such impotence existing in Christ's case as in his own" (*St Paul*, p. 64). That which was the grand influence in Paul's life, and without which it would have proved a failure, is also described as "identification with Christ," a "clinging to His unseen power of goodness." In the present volume also, we find the following: "And this total stamp of 'grace and truth,' this exquisite conjunction and balance, in an element of mildness, of a method of inwardness perfectly handled, and a self-renouncement perfectly kept, was found in Jesus alone" (p. 215). And again, Christ is affirmed to be so immeasurably above His contemporaries, that

their testimony of Him must be described as a "report of that immense reality, not fully, nor half fully, grasped by them, the *mind* of Christ."

If, then, "the infinite of the religion of Jesus lies principally in the line of extricating more and more His sweet reasonableness, and applying it to His method and secret" (p. 379); if the "work of Jesus, like the name of God, calls up a multitude of emotions and associations far more than any brief definition can cover" (p. 192); if He be perfect as the power that "makes for righteousness is perfect;" if in portraying Him we can only throw out words at a vast object which we cannot grasp, just as we do in speaking of God; if the unfolding of His "sweet reasonableness," is to occupy the whole after history of the world; and if the "power which makes for righteousness," can be known by us only as we know the mind of Christ; if God and Christ are so indissolubly connected, that we can only "come to the Father by Him;" and if Christ be a person, —then where is the difficulty of thinking of God as a person? So far from it being a difficulty, is it not an absolute necessity?

The whole drift and bearing of the book, however, the whole tendency of its argument, is towards the conclusion that Christ was not more than man. Indeed, unless Mr Arnold has proved this, he has failed of his purpose, has failed to satisfy the "Zeitgeist," and also to overcome the antipathies and prejudices of the followers of Mr Bradlaugh. His great aim is to shew that both Old Testament and New Testament religion owe their existence simply to the fact that the Jews had a natural genius for righteousness. He says, "If you want to know plastic art, you go to the Greeks; if you want to know science, you go to the Aryan genius; and why? Because they have the speciality for these things, for making us feel what they are, and giving us an enthusiasm for them. Well, and so have Israel and the Bible a specialty for righteousness, for making us feel what it is, and giving us an enthusiasm for it" (p. 324). There is, however, this immense difference in the case of the righteousness of the Bible,—which Mr Arnold does not remark, although it belongs even to his own conception of it,—a difference so great, as to make his illustration from Greek and Aryan genius altogether beside the mark, that we have there a *complete and perfect* model presented for our study. By no

one but Christ has perfection in *anything* been attained. In no statue that was ever chiselled has even the imperfect idea of the artist been fully realised. In the noblest buildings ever raised by man, there are lines and features which come short of the standard of perfect beauty. In all works of art, we see only degrees of attainment; and we cannot predict that the best of them will never be surpassed. A Raphael, a Titian, a Michael Angelo, has each his characteristic defects. All art, in short, is but an imperfect interpretation of nature, the only perfect model. Science, again, is but in its infancy. It is but the interpretation of nature in another form; and we expect it yet to make achievements infinitely greater than have ever been witnessed in the past. Christ, then, stands to religion in the same relation as not the Greeks, not the Italians, not the Aryans, do to art or science, but as nature does. He is its perfect pattern, its realised ideal. Like nature, He is inexhaustible. All the after history of religion is to be but the interpretation and manifestation of what He has said and done. Even in the view of Him taken by Mr Arnold, He represents a "total perfection," which, for the whole future, by the aid of His own influence, and "by thinking, observing, and reading," men will be pressing towards, but never altogether reaching.

But here we have Mr Arnold, who objects to believe in the miracles of prophecy which foretell Christ's coming, and in the miracles which He performed when on earth, portraying to us the miracle of a "perfect man." If the "time-spirit," as he says, forbid him to believe in these miracles, surely it must for once at least be mistaken; for to be consistent, it ought to forbid him to believe in the greater miracle of Christ Himself. Admit that Christ is even what Mr Arnold says He is, and surely it is not beyond belief that the great "coming event" of His life on earth should "cast the shadow" of prophecy "before" it. Admit that He is this, and surely that He should do works which none other man did, is only what we might expect.

Our space does not permit us to do more than to examine the leading positions of Mr Arnold; but they are the support of his whole superstructure. If popular theology, as he affirms, follows naturally and inevitably from the belief in a personal God, Mr Arnold's all depends upon the overthrow of

this fundamental position. He contributes nothing original to the criticism of the documents of the Bible.

We do not affirm,—however fundamentally wrong may be his leading position; however useless the Christianity he has discovered may be for human wants; however powerless to conquer the passions, to comfort the sorrows, to support the highest aspirations and hopes of man; however the leading conclusions he has reached may shock at once both our intellects and our hearts,—we do not affirm, notwithstanding this, that he has contributed nothing of any value to the defence of Christianity. Certain aspects of it he has described with incomparable tact and power; and by bringing to bear upon them a concentrated light, has discovered the beauty of traits and features which its grander and divine proportions often dwarf and overshadow. The very beauty, however, of what he reveals, necessitates the presence of something greater to support it, to fill it up, and to round it into a whole of harmonious and finished symmetry. The real value and significance of the book, indeed is, that it is an *unconscious demonstration* of the supernatural origin of Christianity. It is not without interest also, in that it may be regarded as the blossom and flower of that political broad churchism, which aims at a state church which shall include every kind of religious opinions. The caricature of Christianity which Dr Arnold here does battle for, is its natural and full development. Only when Christianity has become the shadowy and indefinable thing here vaguely depicted, will the dream of such a state church be practically realised; but it is to be hoped, that when those who cherish such views, behold this portentous image of the natural and legitimate consequences of their own thoughts and endeavours, they may repent in time.

T. FINLAYSON HENDERSON.

## ART. VII.—*The Testimony of Ancient Monuments to the Historic Truth of Scripture.*

*Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records stated anew: in eight Lectures, delivered in Oxford University at the Bampton Lectures for* 1859. London: Murray. 1859.

*Our Work in Palestine.* By the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. London: Bentley. 1873.

*Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund.*

*Layard's Nineveh and its Remains.* London: Murray.

THE Old Testament, while not professing to give a full and connected history of the Hebrew race, or of any particular era of that history, does contain fragmentary references, which are professedly historical, to the progenitors of Israel—their religion—their kings—their capital—their temple—their conquests—their reverses:—subjects which more or less directly relate to the gradual development of the great remedial plan which is the underlying theme of all Scripture.

Of these and other historical portions of the Bible, the sceptic questions the truthfulness and authenticity. It is admitted that we are entitled to sit in judgment on this claim of Scripture. To try that claim is the prerogative and the proper province of Reason. It behoves us to test the credibility of the writers of this book, in the same way as we test the credibility of a witness in a court of justice.

There are several ways of testing the veracity of a witness. One of these is to compare his averments with those of other competent and independent witnesses. If, at many different points, and especially on matters of an incidental kind, his testimony thoroughly agrees with theirs, the fair and legitimate conclusion is, that he is entitled to, and worthy of, credit.

Similarly, one of the numerous arguments by which the authenticity and reliability of the Bible are established, is drawn from the conformity of the facts incidentally mentioned by the sacred writers with the state of things at the time, and among the people, of which they speak, as that is represented by foreign and altogether independent accounts.

This conformity proves that the writers of the Bible possessed a kind of local knowledge, which could only belong to persons living at the time when the things spoken of were transacted, and consequently capable, by their situation, of being well-informed of the facts which they relate.

Paley, in his immortal work on the Christian Evidences, when treating of what he calls the "auxiliary evidence," devotes a chapter to this very argument. Treading in the steps of Lardner, who, with consummate learning and ability, had handled this same argument before him, he singles out forty-one incidental allusions, contained in the Gospels and the Acts, to persons and things,—Jewish, Roman, and Grecian,—and, comparing these with detailed quotations from Josephus (who, being a Jew, was a witness not open to the suspicion of being biassed in favour of the New Testament writers), and also from pagan authorities, he shews the perfect accordance of the latter with the writers of the Gospels and the Acts. This agreement proves the authenticity and reliability of the statements contained in the New Testament.

Paley's interesting and ingenious argument, to which we can only refer, has never been answered by the opponents of Christianity, and we venture to say never will be answered.

Our line of reasoning in the present article will run parallel to that of Paley, in the chapter of his book to which we have alluded. But the sources whence we draw our proofs will be different from his. We do not go to ancient writers, but confine ourselves to the testimony of sculptures, monuments, or other remains of antiquity. These are the silent yet eloquent witnesses which we shall call into court, and to which we shall ask the reader to listen as they reply to the question,—What have they to say about the facts mentioned by the sacred writers? Do these ancient remains contradict or tally with the statements of the Bible?

Traditions of a deluge which swept over the earth are, as is well known, to be found among almost all nations. In the sacred books of the Parsees who inherit the worship and ideas of the ancient Persians; in the writings of the Egyptian historian Manetho; among the Greeks and Latins, in whose mythology, as we know from the extant writings of Lucian and Ovid, the flood of Deucalion had a place; in China and India in the far east, and among the Mexicans, Brazilians, Peruvians, and Cubans of the far west; as also among the Indian tribes of North America;—among these various peoples, traditional traces exist in diverse forms of this great world-catastrophe. In some cases, indeed, the tradition is less distinct, and mixed with extraneous circumstances of a purely legendary character;

but in others its coincidence with the narrative of Scripture is much more close and obvious.

Among the Assyrian remains which are preserved in the British Museum through the enterprising labours of Layard and other excavators of the ruins of Nineveh, a series of clay tablets has been found, bearing inscriptions in the cuneiform character, which contain an interesting Chaldean legend of the Noahic deluge. They have quite recently been deciphered and translated by Mr George Smith, the first Assyrian scholar living. These tablets, which were much mutilated, have been, with great labour and industry, collected from many thousands of fragments, and carefully pieced together; and, missing portions having been lately discovered at Nineveh by Mr Smith, who went thither for this special purpose, nearly the entire text of this legend of the flood has now been recovered and translated. The legend, inscribed in cuneiform characters on these tablets, was originally contained in a language which has become extinct. The record belonged to the city of Erech, situated on the Euphrates to the south of Babylon, which was founded by Nimrod, one of the most ancient cities of the old world. When the Chaldean monarchy was overthrown by the Assyrian power, this record seems to have been taken, along with other spoils, to Nineveh, the capital of the victors, and deposited in the royal library. There, in course of time,—when the Chaldean language appears to have become a dead tongue, — it was translated by Assyrian *literati* into the vernacular of the country from the Chaldean text. This Assyrian translation of a more ancient document, it is held, must be referred to a date not more recent than the seventeenth century before Christ—*i.e.*, it must be at least thirty-six centuries old; and it is believed that it may be much older.

In the following points, the legend in question agrees with the Bible narrative. It states that the deluge was sent by Heaven as a punishment for the wickedness of the world; that it was not a local or partial, but a universal disaster; that the whole of mankind, except the speaker (who personates Noah) and his family, perished; that a floating vessel or ship was the means of preserving those who were saved; that, by the Divine command, the speaker caused the lower animals to enter the ship with his male and female servants, after which he shut the door; that birds were sent out from the ship, by

which the abating of the waters of the flood was ascertained—first, a dove, which, finding no rest, returned, and then a raven, which did not return; that the ark or ship rested on a mountain; and that, on their leaving the ark, those who were preserved built an altar and offered a sacrifice. Such are the points of agreement. In other particulars the legend diverges from, or disagrees with, the narrative in Genesis. It calls the means of preservation a ship; makes the height and breadth of the vessel equal; introduces in addition to a dove, a swallow, which returned; speaks of the leaks having been stopped with bitumen; makes no mention of the clean animals having entered the ark in seven pairs; includes others besides the family of the builder; gives no date of the commencement of the building of the vessel, and differs widely from the writer of Genesis as to the duration of the flood.

The mythical accretions and pagan corruptions which in this story have gathered round the original tradition of a deluge, shew that it could not have taken its written form until that moral declension of mankind, which the writer of Genesis mentions as marking the post-diluvian generation, had been well developed. But no other tradition of the deluge, if we except the Scripture narrative, can be shewn to have been committed to writing so early as this, which has been covered up and preserved by the kindly mould of twenty-five centuries, and is now brought to light to testify what the world said about the great flood nearly, or possibly more than, 4000 years ago. The legend, though bearing on its surface indications of its mythical character, speaks at the same time to a back-ground of historical fact, from which the tradition undoubtedly took its rise. And it incontestably proves that the nearer we approach the original cradle and homestead of the human race—Ararat in Armenia,—and the higher we ascend in the scale of time, the more closely does legendary tradition of the archaic times of the world approximate to, and harmonise with, the Scripture record.

Let us take the latter part of Genesis, where the scene is laid in Egypt, the country in which there was the earliest development of national life. It so happens, that in Egyptian tombs and temples, records and representations of Egyptian life and manners, as they existed in the archaic periods of the history of that people, have been preserved, and have come

down to our day in a state of wonderful completeness. These monuments, by shewing a minute agreement between the statements of the Bible and the usages of ancient Egypt, strikingly confirm and prove the historical accuracy and credibility of the writer of Genesis.

According to this writer, the king is absolute or nearly so; commits men to prison, releases them, or commands their execution, at his pleasure. While he has counsellors or ministers whose advice he asks, he imposes taxes by his own authority. His court is organised in oriental fashion. He is surrounded by a body-guard under a captain, whose duty it is to execute the sentences which the king pronounces on offenders. He has bakers to purvey for the royal table, cup-bearers to wait upon him. He uses a signet-ring, and rides in a chariot. We have a picture of a somewhat advanced state of civilisation. There are various orders and professions—those namely of soldiers, priests, physicians, magicians, literati. There are numerous granaries throughout the land for storing grain; mention is made of a silver cup, of a golden neck-chain, and of the use of fine linen. The sitting posture is observed at meals; sweet spices are imported from Arabia; the bodies of the dead are embalmed at great cost.

Now, in this entire description of southern Egypt, in the days of Joseph, there is not one particular which is out of harmony with what we know of the country, at that remote period (according to the commonly received chronology, not less than about 3600 years ago), from the sculptures and mural pictures of its tombs and temples.

The circumstance mentioned by the writer of Genesis, that Pharaoh wore a ring, which he took from his hand and put upon Joseph's hand, implying as it does the use of a signet-ring by the Egyptian monarch, has received a remarkable illustration by the discovery at Nineveh, among the ruins of the ancient city, of an impression on clay made by the bezel of a metallic finger-ring, bearing on it the image, name, and titles of the Egyptian king Sabaco; and by the recovery there of the actual signet-rings of two of the ancient monarchs.

In the same way, the historical truth of the Book of Exodus is shewn by the minute agreement of its references to Egyptian life with the customs of the country as delineated on its monuments. The new king that arose after the death

of Joseph claimed the whole race of the Hebrews, now become numerous, as his slaves. They were doomed to oppressive servile labour in brickmaking, building, and land cultivation. They were smitten by their native taskmasters, who in their turn were flogged if the tasks of the men under them were not fulfilled. Straw was a material used in making sun-dried bricks, doubtless for the purpose of making them more cohesive; and, as they were latterly required to procure straw for themselves, they spread themselves over the land and gathered stubble.

The monuments fully confirm and illustrate all this. They show that bricks were extensively used for building purposes in the country—pyramids, dwelling-houses, tombs, walls of towns, fortresses, and the inclosures of temples, being all constructed of this material. A large portion of the brickfields belonged to the king, who held a monopoly of the manufacture; and bricks made in these royal brick-works bore the stamp of the king's name. Both stubble and straw have been found in ancient bricks; and the royal stamp has also been seen on many.

On the walls of a tomb at Thebes,—which the Italian Rosellini first brought to light and described,—there is a picture of a gang of slaves engaged in brick-making, which Rossellini himself believed (and the opinion is shared by others) to represent the bondage of the Israelites, and which certainly agrees in every particular with the narrative in Exodus. Some of the labourers are employed in carrying the clay in vessels, some in working it up with the straw; others are taking the bricks out of the moulds and setting them in rows to dry; while others, by means of a yoke on their shoulders, from which ropes are suspended at each end, are seen carrying away the bricks already dried. Among the slaves, supposed to be Hebrews, there are seen four figures—Egyptians—very distinguishable by their figure and complexion. Three of these are undoubtedly taskmasters, for they bear rods in their hands; they are watching the gang, and threatening to bastinado the idle. A reference to Sir Gardiner Wilkinson's work on the "*Ancient Egyptians*," or to other works on Egyptian antiquities, will satisfy any candid inquirer as to the minuteness of the correspondence between the Egyptian picture and the Bible narrative. If the question be asked, How came such a picture

to be found in a tomb at Thebes, which is far distant from Goshen? the answer is, Roscherê, in whose memory this tomb was erected, was a high officer of the king, being overseer of the public buildings, and having charge of all the works undertaken by the crown. Hence, in his tomb are two colossal statues, a sphinx, and representations even of the labourers who hewed the stoneworks which he, by virtue of his office, had caused to be made in his lifetime. Any royal undertaking in any part of the kingdom was naturally enough represented in the tomb of this officer, under whose control this department of public works seems to have been placed. There is no difficulty in supposing that gangs of Hebrew slaves were deported, at least for a time, to great distances, for it is expressly said that "*the people were scattered abroad* throughout all the land of Egypt."

Let us pass from Egypt to Palestine.

No thoughtful reader of the account which is given in the books of Kings and Chronicles of the temple erected by Solomon, can fail to receive a distinct and vivid impression that it must have been a grand and imposing structure. The design of the edifice was conceived under inspiration derived from God's express announcement to Solomon, that to him was reserved the execution of the cherished purpose which his father David had been divinely forbidden from fulfilling; and the scale on which the operations were conducted, shews how vast and costly the undertaking must have been. We read of 70,000 bearers of burdens, of 80,000 hewers in the mountains of Lebanon, whence the stones were conveyed to Jerusalem; and, besides, of 3300 overseers of the work,—total, 153,300. This was the number of hands employed during a period of seven years. Mention is made of "the hewn stones, great and costly," and specially of the "foundation stones," both of the house of the Lord and of Solomon's own house, which latter it took thirteen years to erect. 15 feet and 12 feet of length are measurements of these stones which are expressly given.

It is an interesting question, Is there aught discovered among the ruins of Jerusalem that speaks of the grandeur of its ancient temple, and bears out these averments of the Old Testament? The recent investigations of Captain Warren and others happily enable us to give a fuller answer to this

question than could have been given a few years ago; and there is reason to hope that results still more important will reward the labours of future explorers in this field. We shall single out a few facts which, in a manner the most convincing, confirm the statements of the Old Testament to which we have made reference.

It is now certain that the irregular parallelogram forming the south-east portion of modern Jerusalem, called the *Haram Es Sheriff*, or Noble Sanctuary, is identical with the sacred enclosure on the summit of Mount Moriah, within which stood the house of the Lord, and the several courts of the temple. We know therefore for certain that the temple stood on a stupendous artificial platform, inclosing the summit of the mount by means of a wall of colossal masonry, which rose above the rocky foundation in some places to the height of 152 feet. Add to this 160 feet, the further height to which the pinnacle of the temple-porch rose above the top of the containing wall; and still add the descent of 114 feet to the bed of the Kedron valley, which lay to the east of this wall to this depth before being filled up, as it now is, with rubbish, and you have 426 feet as the height to which the massive edifice rose above the eye of a spectator standing in the Kedron valley below.[1]

The length of this temple area, north and south, is 1500 feet; its breadth, from east to west, about 900 feet. The opposite sides are somewhat longer. We may thus ascertain its capability of giving accommodation to the males of the Israelites, who were required by the law to repair from all parts of the land to Jerusalem at certain of the great festivals. The Coliseum at Rome is said to have seated 87,000 spectators, and to have been capable of accommodating 22,000 more in

[1] Very many of our readers have doubtless some acquaintance with Edinburgh, and it may usefully help them to realise by the imagination the height of the pinnacle of the ancient temple to the eye of one who stood in the bed of the valley beneath, to subjoin the following comparison of the heights of one or two structures in the Scottish metropolis. That pinnacle was exactly four times loftier than the height of the parapet of Dean Bridge above the stream below; about five times the height of the *façade* of the Museum of Science and Art; about three times the height of the head of the statue on Melville's Monument in St Andrew Square. Or let the reader suppose the Scott Monument doubled in height, and then add 26 feet, and he will have some conception of the height of the object of which we are speaking.

its area and passages,—in all 109,000. For such a number to have been crammed within its walls, the space for each person must have been limited to about 18 inches by 20 inches. But allowing a square yard for each worshipper in the temple, the sanctuary, courts, and cloisters could have contained 210,000,—a larger number than the entire population of Edinburgh.

The colossal masonry of the foundation courses of the temple wall, which Captain Warren examined by sinking shafts through 70 or 80 feet of rubbish accumulated by the successive reverses that have befallen the city, bears out the Bible statements to which we have alluded. The height of these courses varies from upwards of 3 feet to 6 feet. Stones were found by Warren measuring 15 and 18 feet long,—one 38 feet 9 inches. But these stones, we are informed, were not prepared on the spot. The writer of the First Book of Kings informs us that "The house was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither, so that there was neither hammer nor axe, nor any tool of iron, heard in the house while it was in building." The stone-dressing was mainly done in Lebanon, by the Tyrian masons, although materials may also have been prepared elsewhere. When Captain Warren pierced down to the foundation-courses of the Temple-wall, he found in the adjacent rubbish at the bottom of his shafts no stone-chippings or dressings,—a plain indication that the stones had been hewn in another place. He found also that, like some portions of the wall which are uncovered, the stones of these subterranean courses were dressed round the edges, in the style of Phœnician masonry, traces of which are to be seen in the ruins of ancient Tyre; and, on the foundation-courses at various parts of the south and east walls, which have never been disturbed—70 or 80 feet below the present surface—he found masonic marks in Phœnician letters, some of them filled in with red paint,—the indubitable quarry-marks which Hiram's masons had tooled upon their handiwork in the mountains of Lebanon nearly 3000 years ago. Letters were found on the several courses so ancient, that they appear to be the common progenitors of the Greek, Samaritan, and Chaldean alphabets. They were undoubtedly intended to shew in what course the stones were to be placed,—the second

letter of this archaic alphabet occurring on stones of the second course, the fourth on stones of the fourth course, and so on.

In the temple courts, there was a certain space which Gentile foreigners were allowed to enter; but this was railed off from the part of the building allotted to Jews by a balustrade or reticulated wall, which a Gentile might not pass without incurring the guilt of sacrilege. Upon this balustrade, Josephus informs us, stood pillars, bearing an inscription which forbade a foreigner to go in under pain of death. There is a distinct reference in the Acts to this prohibitory law, in the mention which is made of the ferment which was occasioned in Jerusalem by Paul's supposed violation of the sanctuary, and of the narrow escape of the apostle from the fury of the populace, who would, but for the interposition of the captain of the guard, have torn him in pieces. He had been seen in the city, some time previous, in the company of one Trophimus, a Gentile from Ephesus, and the mob imagined, when they found him engaged in the temple in religious observances along with certain Jews, that these Jews were Greeks. The Asiatic Jews, who seem to have been specially bitter in their antipathy to Paul, whom they had formerly seen and heard in their synagogues, stirred the rage of the people by crying, "Men of Israel, help; this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people and the law; and brought Greeks also into the temple, and polluted this holy place." One of the stones or pillars on which was inscribed this prohibition has been recently discovered, buried in the foundation of a house close to the place where it must have originally stood, near the north-west angle of the Haram, the inscription being in Greek, and the translation of it as follows: "No stranger is to enter within the balustrade round the temple and enclosure: whoever is caught will be responsible to himself for his death which will ensue."—(*M. Clermont Ganneau.*)

The account which is given in 2 Chronicles of the visit of the Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem, makes mention of some of the magnificent sights in the city which filled her with astonishment; more especially of the imposing grandeur of Solomon's temple, and of "his ascent, by which he went up into the house of the Lord." This "ascent" can only mean an approach leading from the palace to the temple which the

king used when he went on solemn festivals to worship in the sacred edifice. The king's palace, we know, was built on Mount Zion, westward of the temple which stood on the summit of Moriah. Between these two hills there lay a deep ravine, called by Josephus the Tyropœon. No trace has been found of a flight of stairs connected with the west wall, and leading upwards to the interior of the temple from the valley beneath; and we therefore conclude that the ascent which struck the queen with amazement, must have been a lofty and remarkable viaduct, which spanned the ravine, and so connected the upper part of the city, or Mount Zion, with the temple, as to be used by the king when he attended the temple service. That such a viaduct existed in the days of Solomon, and that it must have been one of the most splendid architectural works in the city, and well fitted to impress a stranger, is now established beyond question. In the western wall of the temple inclosure, about thirty-nine feet from the south-west corner, huge stones jut out—their internal surface hewn to a regular curve—which formed the abutment or impost of the first arch, springing from the temple wall, of a colossal bridge, now entirely demolished, which once spanned the valley. One of these stones is twenty-four feet six inches in length; and the entire width of the abutment is about fifty-one feet. The piers which supported the other arches of this structure, and the *voussoirs* of the fallen arches, have been discovered at a great depth imbedded in rubbish and *débris*. Its elevation above the bottom of the ravine could scarcely have been less than a hundred feet. It is apparently this same viaduct which is referred to in 1 Chron. xxvi. 16, "To Shuppim and Hosah the lot came forth westward, with the gate Shallecheth, *by the causeway of the going up*."

Jotham, one of the kings of Judah, who seems to have had a passion for building, is stated by the writer of Chronicles to have carried forward with great labour the fortification of Ophel, the suburb of ancient Jerusalem which was situated to the south of the temple, a work which one of his predecessors may have commenced, and which Manasseh, one of his successors, seems to have completed and strengthened. Of this wall there is no trace whatever on the surface; but deep down, beneath the accumulation of rubbish, it has been discovered, and tracked to a considerable distance, by sinking shafts at

various places; and its masonry, though massive, has been ascertained to be different from that of the temple wall, because belonging to a less remote age.

Mention is made, both in the Book of Kings and by Isaiah, of an upper pool, which must have been outside the walls; of a conduit, by which water was brought within the city; and of certain works of Hezekiah, by which he greatly increased the water supply of Jerusalem. These statements have been strikingly verified by the discovery of several subterranean conduits and reservoirs, designed for storing up a supply for the inhabitants in seasons of drought, and also to enable them to hold out against a protracted siege.

Indeed, there is hardly a place mentioned in the Old Testament which was situated in parts of Palestine that have been searched with some care, the name of which has not been identified as still preserved in a modern Arabic form, sometimes little changed. Such is the tendency in the East to adhere to what is old, and to perpetuate usages and names which claim a venerable antiquity, that even remarkable boulder stones, or massive rocks, which are incidentally referred to in the Old Testament, are being identified by intelligent and competent observers. For example, in describing the boundary line which divided the territory of Judah from that of Benjamin, the writer in Joshua mentions once and again *the stone of Bohan*, the son of Reuben. This identical stone has been found (in the locality defined in those passages) by M. Clermont Ganneau (Dragoman-Chevalier of the French Consulate at Jerusalem); the perfect familiarity of this gentleman with Arabic, as well as the keenness of his observation, supplying him with a clue to the discovery. The *form* of the name has in this case undergone a change; but in the transformation from Hebrew to Arabic, the *meaning* has been retained. "Stone of Bohan" signifies in Hebrew, *stone of the thumb;* and, probably, from the resemblance which it bears to a thumb and finger, it came to be, and is now, called by the Bedawin, *Hajar-el-Asbah*, stone of the finger.

Another instance of identification of the same class, illustrates the retention of the *form* of the name, even in Arabic, with little change. Adonijah, when he attempted to usurp the kingdom after the death of his father David, slew sheep, oxen, and fat cattle, "by the stone of *Zohéleth*, which is by En-rogel.'

En-rogel was near to—close by—Jerusalem, but lower down than the city. It has usually, in modern times, been identified with Bîr Eyub, which, however, is too far south to be on the frontier line described in Joshua on which En-rogel lay. Besides, En-rogel means[1] "the spring of the fuller," whereas *Bîr-Eyub* is not a spring, but a well. M. Ganneau has found in the village of Siloam, over against the south-east corner of the temple wall, on the opposite slope of the Kedron valley, a rocky plateau—its western face cut perpendicularly with rude steps up the face—called by the natives *Ez-Zewéile*, a name exactly similar to Zohéleth. This identification of Zohéleth proves the Fountain of the Virgin, which is close at hand, be the En-rogel of Scripture.

It is an interesting circumstance, that prior to this discovery of M. Ganneau, Biblical scholars whose opinion is of weight, maintained, from an examination of the locality, that the common view as to the situation of En-rogel was erroneous, and that the Fountain of the Virgin *must be* the En-rogel of Scripture. Among those writers who have urged strong *à priori* arguments in favour of the view now established by discovery, may be named Dean Stanley, Mr Grove in Smith's "Biblical Dictionary," and Dr Bonar in his "Land of Promise."

Both in Bible history, and by Josephus and other profane authors, we are told of the successive demolitions and reconstructions of the walls of the temple and the city of Jerusalem. Seventeen times it has been taken and pillaged. But though the fury of invaders and destroyers overthrew again and again the upper portions of the megalithic masonry of those temple walls, the very ruins were a defence to the lower parts, which have accordingly remained undisturbed from the time of Solomon. One who examines the upper courses of the temple wall as it now stands, reads there a plain, though unwritten and unsculptured, record of the unparalleled changes through which that edifice has passed. He sees and peruses a palpable commentary on the narratives of Scripture. He looks on old materials which had doubtless formed part of the original wall, but had suffered under the power of the unrelenting captor, and were in troublous times, like those of Ezra or Nehemiah, or in the times of the Roman and Saracen restorers, hastily re-fashioned and put together.

[1] The Targum, and Arabic, and Syriac versions.

He finds large blocks often placed at right angles to their original position, fragments of the shafts and cornices of pillars built in with square stones, and the tenon and mortise joints, which in the uncemented work of the founder bound stone to stone, laid bare in the very face of the work.

Have we not here an illustration and confirmation of the entire current of the Bible record regarding Jerusalem, as distinct, conclusive, and unanswerable, as though it had been "printed in a book," or "graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever?"

We now cross the Jordan, and take up one or two references of the Old Testament, to the land of Moab.

*Moab* being contiguous to the territory of Israel, and separated from it only by the Jordan and the Dead Sea, is often mentioned in the Old Testament. Between the two peoples there must have been in times of peace much intercourse. In the days of the judges, for example, Naomi emigrated from Bethlehem with her husband into Moab on account of a famine, and their sons married women of that country. Ruth, the Moabitess, came from Moab to Bethlehem with her mother-in-law on her return. Having been an independent people from the time of Solomon, the Moabites were re-subjugated by Omri, the father of Ahab. During the reign of Omri, and also of Ahab, they were tributary to Israel; and considering the size of the country, their annual tribute must have been felt to be a burdensome and galling yoke, for it consisted of no fewer than 100,000 lambs, with the same number of rams, and their wool. At the date of Ahab's death, Moab was ruled over by a king whose name was *Mesha*. So recently as the year 1868, the Rev. F. A. Klein, when riding past *Dhibán* (the ancient *Dibon*), observed a stone with engraved characters, which has since become famous as *the Moabite stone;* for it was ascertained by learned antiquarians and scholars, on careful examination of imperfect copies of the inscription, to be a genuine Moabite monumental record, unquestionably the oldest Semitic stone-record yet discovered. According to the usual chronology, it is held to date about 900 years B.C., *i.e.*, to be nearly 2800 years old, and thus to be even more ancient than Homer. The stone having unhappily been broken into fragments by the jealous natives when they

perceived that great importance was attached to it by Europeans, a considerable portion of it is lost, perhaps beyond recovery, and for this reason the inscription is only partially known. Several gaps necessarily make the attempts to translate it to some extent conjectural. Still, no doubt exists as to the general meaning and tenor of the inscription. It is a narrative by Mesha, the king of Moab (already named), of certain of his battles which issued in the overthrow of Israel. That this Mesha must be the same king of Moab who is mentioned in Second Kings, is evident from the fact, that these battles occurred during the reigns of Omri and Ahab. The entire number of letters on the monument was little over 1000; the number preserved is 669. Thus, after a period of about 2800 years, a monument has come to light belonging to the age of King Ahab and the prophet Elisha, and referring to events which were contemporaneous with some of those narrated in the books of Kings and Chronicles. The question of interest for a believer in the credibility and authority of Scriptures is, Does this monument touch on the matters mentioned in the Bible, and is there harmony or discrepancy between them? Such a relic of the remote past has much value for the archæologist and the student of language. But it has a very special interest for a Christian, and also for an honest inquirer into the claims of the Bible to be received as the Word of God. If it shall be found to accord with Scripture, then the conclusion is irresistible that, so far as it goes, it supplies valuable confirmation of the accuracy and trustworthiness of that portion of sacred history.

Now, it is important to find that the narrative inscribed on this ancient stone, fits in perfectly to the period following the death of Ahab, when, according to the writer in Second Kings, Mesha rebelled against Israel. It was natural that an Israelitish historian should be silent regarding the victories of the King of Moab. But we can infer from his statements, that the Israelites at that period were inferior in military prowess to the Moabites; inasmuch as, according to the writer in Second Kings, Joram, the King of Israel, was afraid to undertake an expedition against Moab alone, because he asked and obtained the aid of Jehoshaphat, the King of Judah, and entered also into an alliance with the King of Edom. And it further appears, that these three allied armies, led by their respective

sovereigns, did not venture to go up against the enemy in a direct and straightforward invasion, but stealthily; and that they were eventually driven out of the territory of Moab.

Besides, this Moabite stone mentions thirteen out of the twenty names of places in the land of Moab which occur in Scripture. When we read the translation of it, which learned men have agreed in giving us, and find the names Arnon, Aroer, Ataroth, Baalmeon, Beth-diblathaim, Bezer, Nebo, all of which occur in Kings or Isaiah, &c., we seem as if we were almost reading a portion of Old Testament history.

Tested by a contemporaneous and independent record—the record of a hostile people—the statements of the writer of Second Kings are found to be accurate and truthful; and he is shewn, as a historian, to be a competent witness and thoroughly trustworthy.

In the historical and prophetical portions of the Old Testament, frequent mention is made of the *Assyrians*, a Mesopotamian people, whose kings were mighty warriors, who pushed their conquests far and wide, and, wherever their arms were victorious, made their power to be acknowledged in the shape of tribute. They over-ran the regions which lay between them and the shores of the Caspian and the mountains of Caucasus; subjugated peoples as far as the northern parts of Arabia, Egypt, and Ethiopia; and penetrated through Syria and Asia Minor as far as the islands of the Mediterranean. The armies of Assyria often invaded the land of Israel, both during the time of the judges and of the kings; and not only to Jerusalem and Samaria, before whose walls they time after time appeared, but to the whole people, they were an object of continual dread. Had the Assyrians possessed a literature which had come down to us through the centuries, there would no doubt have been in it references to the land of Israel, its people, its capital, its history, its religion, which would have afforded data for testing or illustrating the Scriptures, and which would have figured in the discussion of the question of their authenticity. But the Assyrian empire was absorbed,—that once great people were wiped out from the list of nations,—and Nineveh, their city, was utterly destroyed nearly twenty-five centuries ago, so as to be almost forgotten before history began. And they left no literature behind them to preserve the memory of their arts and their civilisation.

Except that by ancient Greek writers, as Herodotus and Xenophon, the tradition was preserved that the great Assyrian capital stood on the banks of the Tigris, and that a vague impression was handed down from age to age among the nomadic tribes inhabiting the region, that a great city once existed in the locality, which is marked at wide intervals by huge mounds, and is now a scene of utter desolation,—the very knowledge of its site was obliterated from memory. Lucian (himself born on the banks of the Euphrates), wrote thus in the second century of our era: "Nineveh has so perished that no vestiges of it remain, nor can it be easily ascertained where it formerly stood."

But in our day these mounds have been opened up by the enterprise of Layard, Botta, and others. The sculptured remains of the palaces and temples of ancient Nineveh have been recalled from the oblivion of twenty-five centuries; the language in which the inscriptions are written, long utterly forgotten, has been recovered by processes equally laborious and ingenious; and we can now ascertain, by the assistance of learned men, what these people, extinct for ages, tell us on their monuments of themselves and the nations, Israel included, with which they were brought into connection. Let us inquire how far these references to Israel on the Assyrian tablets—selecting only a few—tally with the Bible.

The inscription on the Nimroud obelisk in the British Museum refers to *Jehu*, king of Israel. From this obelisk we learn the curious fact that Samaria went also under the name of Beth-Omri, for the same reason that led Omri himself to call it by the name of Samaria, after *Shamar*, from whom, according to the writer in First Kings, he bought the hill so called for two talents of silver. If Omri called it after the name of its former owner, other people would seem to have called it, reasonably enough, after himself, the proprietor by purchase, and the founder of the city which stood upon it. On the same obelisk stands the name of Hazael, who, we know, was contemporary with Jehu. The name of *Menahem*, king of Israel, has been found on a bas-relief among the names of other monarchs paying tribute to the King of Assyria. Place the inscription on that Nimroud slab alongside of the following entry in the Second Book of Kings xv. 19, respecting the war indemnity which the Israelites had to pay to their conquerors: "And Pul, the King of Assyria, came against

the land, and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his (Menahem's) hand: And Menahem exacted the money of Israel, even of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man fifty shekels of silver, to give to the King of Assyria."

Among the remains of Nineveh have been discovered the annals of *Tiglath-pileser*, the Assyrian king who, eight centuries before Christ, during the reign of Pekah, emptied whole districts of Palestine, and carried the inhabitants captive to Assyria. The ravages which the successor of this man, *Shalmanezer* (mentioned in Second Kings), the Sargon of Isaiah xx., and the father of Sennacherib, committed on the ill-fated kingdom of Israel, are mentioned in an inscription found in the ruins of Khorsabad palace, of which he was the founder and builder. It states that 27,280 *Israelites* were carried captive by him from Samaria, and the districts or towns around that city. This is a large deportation, when we consider that the same region had been repeatedly pillaged and depopulated in the same way. It is highly probable that this is the great and final deportation mentioned in Second Kings xvii. 6: "In the ninth year of Hoshea, the King of Assyria [Shalmanezer is mentioned] in a preceding verse took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and Habor [the modern Khabour], by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

Let us single out for mention one or two incidents in the Assyrian annals of Sargon's son and successor, *Sennacherib*, in which the Bible records and the Assyrian meet. Most of us have read with emotion the Bible account of the invasion of Judah by this proud tyrant; the insolent defiance which was hurled by his general Rabshakeh at Judah's king and Judah's God; the fervour with which good Hezekiah, sore bestead, besought help from God in his extremity; and the inglorious retreat of the haughty invader, when the angel of the Lord smote his swarming battalions, and Judah was preserved, though not an arrow was shot from the battlements of its capital, nor a warrior sallied forth from its gates. The walls of the Kouyunjik palace of Nineveh, which Mr Layard shews to have been built by Sennacherib, bear inscriptions, which are the public records of the achievements of the reign of this king. They tell that in the third year of his reign he over-ran the

whole of Syria; and, in connection with this Syrian campaign, they make mention of Hezekiah, king of Judah; of his having refused, on Sennacherib sending a message to him, to submit to the Assyrian crown; of the fenced cities of Judah having been thereupon spoiled by the invader, and tribute having been exacted from their unresisting king. The coincidence between all this and what is mentioned in the Bible history, is so marked and so interesting, that it is worth our while to place the two accounts side by side for the sake of comparison.

*The Bible Narrative.*

"In the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, did Sennacherib, king of Assyria, come up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them. . . And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah, king of Judah, 300 talents of silver, and 30 *talents of gold.* And Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house. At that time did Hezekiah cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of the Lord, and from the pillars which Hezekiah had overlaid, and gave it to the king of Assyria.

*The Narrative of the Assyrian Inscriptions.*

"Because Hezekiah, king of Judah, did not submit to my yoke, 46 of his strong fenced cities, and innumerable smaller towns which depended on them, I took and plundered; but I left to him Jerusalem his capital city, and some of the inferior towns around it. . . And because Hezekiah still continued to refuse to pay the homage, I attacked and carried off the whole population, fixed and nomad, which dwelled around Jerusalem, with 30 *talents of gold*, and 800 talents of silver, the accumulated wealth of the nobles of Hezekiah's court."

It will be observed that the amount of the treasure in gold taken from Hezekiah (30 talents), is the same in the two perfectly independent accounts,—a remarkable coincidence. The difference in the amount of silver may be explained by the fact, that Hezekiah was hard pressed by Sennacherib and compelled to give him all the wealth that he could collect in order to satisfy his demands. The Assyrian record probably gives the aggregate value of the precious metal taken away, while the Bible estimate may give only what was paid in current money. But even if we suppose that there is exaggeration in the Assyrian account here, it must be admitted that, as Sennacherib was compelled by the sudden and terrible disaster which befel his army, to abandon the siege of Jerusalem and return to Nineveh, it was natural for him to be silent regarding this catastrophe, and to gloss over his virtual defeat by

representing the spoil as the great result of the expedition,—the value of which there was a great temptation to overstate.

When Sennacherib sent his generals to Hezekiah to demand his submission, he was (Second Kings) besieging Lachish, in the south of Palestine, which seems to have been an important and strongly fortified city from the conquest of the Canaanites down to Hezekiah's time. Before the return of these generals from Jerusalem, Lachish had been reduced. Of this siege of Lachish, there is a detailed representation in a series of bas-reliefs, covering thirteen slabs, which Dr Layard discovered at Kouyunjik. Above the head of the king is the following inscription: "Sennacherib, mighty king of the country of Assyria, sitting on the throne of judgment before the city of Lachish; I give permission for its slaughter."

Nineveh was not only a great and splendid city, but very wicked. Its inhabitants were addicted to the abominable superstitions and impure rites of paganism. The book of the prophet Nahum, whose subject is "the burden of Nineveh," gives us a dark picture of its moral and social condition. It asserts the boastful arrogance, idolatry, falsehood, love of conquest, bloodthirsty cruelty, drunkenness, whoredom, superstition, and witchcraft of the people,—crimes which cried to heaven against them, so that they were ripe for destruction, "ready to be devoured as stubble fully dry." Of all these vices, as being characteristic of the Assyrians as a people, the trophies of their art, now rescued from oblivion, are speaking memorials. But this is a point on which we cannot enter. We therefore pass it by with this bare reference, which might be illustrated from the monuments at great length. In truth, their very religious worship was gross and sensual; and by their incursions into other lands and their planting of colonies in the kingdoms which they subdued, they carried their pollutions with them, and became a pest—a moral nuisance—to surrounding countries, which called aloud to heaven, if they repented not, for their overthrow by the besom of divine indignation.

Nahum, writing 114 years before the event, in the eighth century before Christ, foretold the fall of that long-provoked indignation. The seer, vividly realising the event, speaks in the present tense. Fire, sword, and flood execute their commission. There is a multitude of slain, and no end of corpses. The palaces are dissolved; the destruction is complete; the

and the prophecy of Nahum; and if he be an honest and earnest inquirer after truth, he will first be humbled and rebuked, then silenced, and, we hope, convinced. The sceptic asks for more evidence, and here fresh additions of a most remarkable kind are made in our day, to the cumulative proof of the Bible's accuracy and of the veracity of the sacred writers. When the Jews on one occasion, wilfully blind to all the signs or proofs of His commission from God that had already been given, asked Jesus to give them a sign from heaven, He replied that they would have a sign, *not from heaven* but from the *bowels of the earth;* the sign of the prophet Jonah, who went and preached to the Ninevites from "the belly of hell." He meant that He would rise from His grave, and thus "declare Himself with power to be the Son of God." So the sceptic of this age has had his sign from the bowels of the earth. Witnesses to the Bible's credibility have been brought up from the tomb in which they lay buried for ages. These slabs of the palaces of ancient Nineveh, after thirty centuries of years, during which they were utterly unknown, come forth as living witnesses to the truth and accuracy of the Bible record.

The logical conclusion to be drawn from the testimonies which we have been reviewing, it is hardly necessary to state. What proofs would satisfy the doubters, if these, and such as those, at which we have glanced, do not, that the Bible account of the facts in question is true and authentic? Whatever, then, goes to establish the authenticity of parts of the Bible record, goes to prove that the *whole Bible is true and reliable* in its statement of facts. For the book is one connected whole, possessing, in its variety, like an organised structure, real and vital unity. Its various parts are inseparably linked and bound together. It was written by many men, who lived at divers periods, separated from each other by wide intervals of time. But just as in the erection of Solomon's temple, there were a multitude of hands engaged, each individual doing his own piece of work, yet all harmoniously contributing towards the ultimate completion of the vast undertaking, because all were under the guidance and control of a planning and superintending mind, so the several sacred writers, living in various countries and at different epochs (their respective contributions to the one book bearing dates which spread over a space of 1600 years), have

separately, yet in harmony, produced the homogeneous volume which claims to be the Word of God. And its unity can be accounted for only on the principle, that the Divine Mind originated the plan, inspired and directed the instruments, and guided the gradual development of the work.

The rejection of this conclusion involves and necessitates the adoption of another,—the only other that is possible,—and we need not say, that if the sceptic's object in swallowing this theory be to shew the *credulity* of *unbelief*, he will certainly succeed here. The conclusion which he who denies the authenticity and truth of Scripture must needs accept, is that the oldest book in the world, written by a succession of men between whom only a maniac could fancy collusion to be possible,—that this wonderful and blessed book is after all a vile forgery, a piece of imposture; that Moses made a compact with David, Joshua with Solomon, Samuel with Isaiah, Nehemiah with Nahum; and all of these with Jesus, and the evangelists, and the apostles, to perpetuate a forgery, and palm it on the world, in the name of God, and in the interest of religion. The sceptic must maintain, that this book, which is confirmed by testimonies brought from an endless variety of quarters, and which tallies not only with the statements of contemporaneous writers—Jewish, Christian, and Pagan—but with the silent testimony of ruins, ancient paintings, and sculptured stones and tablets, is the product of a set of unprincipled forgers, who combined for a period of 1600 years, the men of one generation with those of remote generations, and the latter with the former, fraudulently to impose a fiction and a falsehood on the credulous. The sceptic must hold this position in the face of the fact, that the evidence of the authenticity of Scripture, is growing and accumulating, in proportion as modern investigation recalls the remains of a distant past from the oblivion which had covered them; and in spite of the other fact, that the concurrent lines of proof are becoming more numerous. We speak as unto wise men, judge ye what we say.

If the *facts* of the Bible are proved, its *doctrines* are established by necessary sequence. The system of Christianity rests on the facts of which the Bible is the faithful record. Let every human intellect do homage to truth, and bow in reverence before its eternal Author. W. THOMSON.

# AMERICAN QUARTERLIES.

1. *The New Englander.* October 1873. New Haven.
2. *The Bibliotheca Sacra, and Theological Eclectic.* October 1873. Andover.
3. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review.* October 1873. New York.

This number of the *New Englander* opens with a sifting criticism on a Paper which recently appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, on the relations between prayer and science. The article is entitled, "The Scientific Demolition of Prayer." The author handles his subject with great judgment, and by an admirable use of the argument from analogy, exposes the presumption of modern scientists who profess, by their discoveries, to have set aside the belief that there is a Power above which controls the occurrence of events in this world, and is moved to avert catastrophes and dispense favours by the prayers of men. He takes up the arguments and objections of such scientists *seriatim*, and very effectually disposes of them. Another paper on "Modern Physical Discoveries and their Limitations," is very seasonable, as a caution against the recklessness with which generalisations are sometimes formed, so as to bring all existing phenomena of mind, as well as of matter, under one and the same system of laws. The other papers are, "Current Fallacies concerning Ordination," from the point of view of what is known as the "Cambridge Platform,"—the system of Church discipline agreed upon by the New England Churches in their Synod at Cambridge in 1648. "How American Women are helping their Sisters," an account of female missionary labours, especially in China and India. "Flies in the Ointment," advocating the practice of extempore speaking, especially on the part of ministers, whose only notes to be consulted should be "the faces of the assembly." "Doctrinal Creeds as Tests of Church Membership;" "The Study of Words;" a striking chapter illustrative of the "Hand of God in History," entitled, "A Reminiscence of Stackpole House;" and an account of the "Friendship of Goethe and Schiller," and the influence they exerted on one another.

2. *The Bibliotheca Sacra* opens with an article to which the precedence is worthily given, on "Law, Providence, and Prayer." We are glad to see such valuable contributions to the discussion of so important a subject in our American contemporaries. The words with which the writer introduces his subject will sufficiently denote the spirit in which it is treated:

"The Christian believer will not readily surrender his faith in the reality and the absoluteness of the Divine government of the world in which we live. To do so would be to abandon a fundamental article of his creed, to ignore one of the clearest and most prominent doctrines of His great Text-book, to cut adrift from the sheet-anchor of His most precious faith, and commit himself to the darkness, the billows, and the

storms, with chance instead of beneficent Providence as his pilot, and, in place of infinitely intelligent purpose, naught but blind inexorable force at the helm."

There follows a discriminating review of "Taine's English Literature," a work which shews how a clever Frenchman reads and appreciates our literature, but which is really of little importance, after all, since no foreigner, least of all a Frenchman, can bring himself into true sympathy with English writers. In a topographical dissertation on "The Place of Elijah's Sacrifice" on Mount Carmel, the writer decides in favour of the tradition, that the place was that now called El-Mohraka, on the top of the Carmel range, at the south-eastern extremity of it. Professor Park continues his homiletic papers on "The Structure of a Sermon,' here discussing the subject of "The Text" as the basis of a sermon. The concluding article is a discussion of that problem of problems, "Sin and Suffering in the Universe, as related to the Power, Wisdom, and Love of God," by Dr Cowles, of Ohio. This is a very thoughtful contribution to the subject, and merits careful study.

3. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* has several very valuable articles in this number. "The Modern English Pulpit," by Dr Lord, discusses the subject historically. The writer sketches briefly, but with a masterly hand, the characteristics of the Greek and Latin Churches in regard to the place and influence of the pulpit in their respective systems. He then more at length describes the position of the Anglican Church, and of the Dissenting Churches of England, as related to it. Speaking of the English Church, he says :

"The predominant characteristic of the modern English Church is a veneration for the Scriptures that is rather lifeless and formal than inspiriting and vitalizing." . . . "It seems to us that the Romish reaction in Great Britain, the Ritualistic movement in the Anglican Church, and the infidelity of its scientific leaders, are largely due to the unfaithfulness of the English pulpit in general to the grand and central idea of ministerial work."

This may have some force, but is not the following too strong?

"The secret of the success of the movement that is now going on in the heart of the Church, and makes men fear the fresh incoming of the decadent Papacy, and its re-investment and its re-coronation by Anglo-Saxon hands, lies in the fact, that the ritualists have seized the pulpit, rescued it from its ignoble position, and are thundering from it in the ears of astonished Englishmen the grand truths of human sin and redemption." . . "The ritualistic movement finds the secret of its progress and the key of its success and the hiding of its power, not in the qualified mass at its altar, not in the bells and lighted candles and burning incense and elevated host of its service ; not in the stole and chasuble of its priests ; not in the attractions of the confessional or the charms of absolution ; but in the magnificent songs and sermons of its poets and preachers."

The characteristics of some of the eminent English preachers, among others of Henry P. Liddon, of whom he speaks as in some respects standing at the head of the modern English pulpit, are very ably and

graphically sketched. The history of the "Vatican Council" is given with great vividness of description and accuracy of detail by Dr Philip Schaff of New York. "Faith: its Place and Prerogative," in regard to "the written word and the Living Word," is a continuation by Dr Welch of previous papers on other aspects of the same subject. The discussion is very able and sound, but we cannot say that its style or manner is at all attractive. Then follows a critical dissertation on "The New Testament meaning of Eternity and Eternal;" "The necessity of Religious Instruction in Colleges;" "Infant Baptism," a subject about which there appears to be a sort of chronic irritation among the churches in America. This paper is a condensed and most masterly discussion. "Life and its Origin," is a review of Dr Bastian's "The Beginnings of Life." Dr Bastian advocates the doctrine of "Spontaneous Generation," or as he calls it, "Archebiosis,"—the "Abiogenesis" of Huxley, *i.e.* the occurrence of the formation of living beings *de novo* out of dead matter, without the agency of pre-existing living matter. The author of this paper, Professor Nicholson of Toronto, enters at some length into this subject, and fairly shews that Bastian has failed to prove his position. We are glad to see a scholar like Professor Nicholson meeting so ably the positions of this school of physicists. The well-known theologian, Dr Maclean of Princeton, enters very fully and satisfactorily into the question of the "Harmony of the Gospel accounts of Christ's resurrection." He concludes from his investigation:

"If Christ really rose from the dead, then we have an easy solution of the fact, that the Gospels are of entire accord in their several accounts of this occurrence, notwithstanding the numerous incidents mentioned by the different writers, and some *seeming* discrepancies in their statements. On the contrary, if Christ did *not* rise from the dead, but His disciples stole away His body from the tomb, then it is inconceivable how—writing as they evidently did without collusion—the Evangelists have made no contradictory statements. In Matthew's account, short as it is, there are no less than thirty distinct incidents mentioned; in Mark's as many, in Luke's not less than fifty, in John's upwards of fifty; yet all the different incidents can be made to form one consistent narrative, *although half of them must be untrue* if Christ be not risen."

The remaining articles are "The contrast between Man and the Brute Creation establishes the Divine origin of the Scriptures," and a brief exposition of "Eating and Drinking Unworthily" in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. M. G. E.

---

## DUTCH AND GERMAN PERIODICALS.

*Theologisch Tijdschrift.* 1873. Nos. V. and VI.

The September number of this periodical contains two essays. The first of these is a paper on Grote's Aristotle, by the Groningen philosopher, Van der Wyck. As this essay is philosophical, not theological, we pass by it, and turn to Professor Kuenen's paper on *Job and the suffering servant of Jahveh*, in which he discusses the view of Seinecke and Hoekstra

—already noticed in our pages (vol. xx. p. 580)—that the ideal figure of Job is a later development of the notion of the Servant in the book of Isaiah. A historical introduction to the paper before us enumerates a considerable list of earlier writers who have regarded Job as the personification of a collective idea. Thus, to pass by less familiar names and authors who have only hinted their views, Warburton regards Job as an allegoric figure representing Israel's sufferings in the days of Nehemiah, and J. D. Michaelis as an allegory of the sufferings in Egypt. The more modern school of supporters of the collective idea begins with Bernstein, but only Seinecke and Hoekstra have made the question really prominent and important. These critics produce three groups of proofs—(1) that Job is a collective; (2) that he personifies Israel; (3) that he is the Servant of the Lord. These three groups our essayist takes up in order, and examines each argument in conclusive but unnecessarily tedious detail. We have no doubt that Professor Kuenen is right in deciding against the new theory, but we find nothing at all memorable in his discussion, and apprehend that the essay extends to so great a length mainly because padding was wanted for the journal. For example, three whole pages are devoted to a defence of Ewald's and Böttcher's view, that in the phrase שְׁבִית שְׁבוּת, the noun is derived from שׁוּב, not from שָׁבָה. We have long held this to be right, but do not find that Professor Kuenen adds anything to an argument already conclusively put by Ewald. The only part of the paper which is really interesting is the conclusion, where the essayist expresses his conviction that the author of Job lived after the captivity, and had read Deutero-Isaiah, but that he uses the conceptions of that book, not as the type of his own construction, but simply as pertinent material for a problem which is not merely Israelitic, but belongs to humanity at large. Job is a type of suffering righteousness in general, and this accounts for expressions throughout the book that are not strictly limited by the situation of the prologue. The problem of the poem is not theocratic. The sufferings of Israel were never wholly inexplicable, even when the righteous suffered with the wicked. The true puzzle of the book of Job could arise only in the contemplation of the suffering of the righteous individual.

The November number opens with a lecture by Professor Tiele, on the method, spirit, and importance of the history of the ancient religions. The lecture, which is the first of an academical course, is very readable. With regard to method, the lecturer urges that philological and ethnological inquiry into the origin of a Deity is not enough. When we know that Jove was originally the bright sky, it does not follow that in later times he was no more. First we must study the actual conception of a Deity in historic times, then seek the original conception, finally the logical connection of the two. Passing to speak of the right spirit of such inquiries, Professor Tiele rejects the theory that truth was among the ancient religions the exclusive property of Israel. We presume that his statements are meant to imply that the whole idea of a specific difference between the religion of Israel and the heathen religions is false. But, if so, he is unfair to the supporters of revelation, in putting it as a necessary part of their case that all that is true in other religions

is borrowed from the Hebrews. The doctrine of the *Logos Spermatikos* is not inconsistent with a belief in special revelation. On the other hand, the writer protests against a current tendency to exalt other religions at the expense of Christianity, and maintains that where this is done, the principles of Christianity are confounded with the imperfections in their realisation among men. The importance of the study is vindicated mainly in connection with the study of theology. The main idea of Mosaism is that of Theocracy, which, however, is the common property of the Semitic-Hamitic religions. This idea was gradually purified, and, when it became so universalised as to lose its national limitation, spread in the West, and gave birth to Christendom, which from the day in which it broke with Judaism, appears as a properly Aryan—that is, a theanthropic, not a theocratic—religion. From this theory, it of course follows that a knowledge of both classes of earlier religions is necessary to the theologian. The notion that Christianity is essentially an Aryan religion, finds not a few supporters in our day, so that this construction of Tiele's need hardly excite surprise. But it is obvious to observe that the specific *differentia* of the Old Testament notion of the Theocracy is its foundation on the idea of Redemption, and that this idea is also fundamental in Christianity. It can also be shewn that the theanthropic notions of Christianity are in the line of Old Testament development, while the whole theory of the lecturer rests on an unhistorical conception of the relation of Pauline teaching to the doctrine of Jesus. An essay by Hoekstra on "The enduring significance of the Gospel of the Cross in the Modern Standpoint," is not yet completed. Tiele follows again with an essay on "Egyptian Records bearing on the Exodus." A very pretentious *brochure* by Dr Eisenlohr, in Heidelberg, which appeared in 1872, offered a translation of a Papyrus, with a popular exposition of the supposed great importance of the document for the history of Moses. The results diverged vastly from the Hebrew record, and in some important points confirmed Manetho. The pamphlet had no aspect of scientific worth, and Chabas, in his *Recherches pour servir à l' Histoire de la XIXe dynastie*, &c. (July 1873), has exploded the whole thing, reiterating the proof that Manetho's account is worthless, refuting Eisenlohr's translation, and confirming the current view that the oppression and exodus of the Hebrews fall under Raamses II. and Menephtah I. Tiele reviews this controversy, decides on all essential points in favour of Chabas, denounces the spirit of humbug displayed in Eisenlohr's popular pamphlet, and closes by summing up the arguments which Chabas brings against the statement of Brugsch, who regards the reign of Menephtah as one of weakness and disorder. Finally, Van der Wijck devotes one article to Fraser's edition of Berkeley, and promises another. The reviewer expresses his agreement with Professor Fraser's apprehension of the doctrine of the Irish philosopher.

*Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie.* 1873. Nos. III., IV.

The third number for the year contains some interesting matter. Hilgenfeld discusses the utterances of Strauss and De Lagarde, which have of late excited so much notice—the former in general society, the

latter in learned circles. Pfleiderer gives some thoughts on *Conscience*, partly by way of reviews of Gass's recent book on the subject; and Siegfried continues his laborious researches on Philo and the text of the LXX. Holtzmann reopens the question of the genuineness and integrity of the Epistle to Philemon—a question which could not fail to force itself on the author of the well-known theory of the interpolation of the Epistle to the Colossians, and the spuriousness of that to the Ephesians. The paper does not profess to reach any more positive result than that the hand which, as the writer holds, shaped the Epistle to the Colossians into conformity with that to the Ephesians, may be traced in Philemon. This conclusion is based on the "unquestionable" literary relation between Phil. verses 4, 5, 6, and Eph. i. 15–17; Col. i. 3, 4, 9. That Paul did not himself write these three passages, is maintained, partly on the basis of Holtzmann's previous inquiries, partly by the argument that πίστις in verse 5, must mean "loyalty" in general. A number of other minutiæ, which may seem to bear on the critical problem, are collected with the usual patience and keenness of the writer, but lead to nothing decisive; and it is suggested that if the whole Epistle is spurious (a position to which Holtzmann is careful not to commit himself), it may have been written by the *Auctor ad Ephesios*, to illustrate historically the dogmatic treatment of the slave-question, given in Eph. vi. 1–9; Col. iii. 22–25. As Holtzmann's book on Ephesians and Colossians has, with all its cleverness and learning, made, so far as we are aware, no converts, this article will probably be not more favourably received.

Professor Grimm contributes an exegetical paper on 1 Cor. xv. 20–28. The main points are as follows:—In ver. 22, πάντες must be taken both times with equal extension, and ζωοποιηθήσονται is, according to Rom. viii. 11, a quickening in Christ, inasmuch as it has its ground in fellowship of the Spirit and of life with Him. In ver. 23, τάγμα is a division. Christ Himself cannot be one division, therefore the second division must be those not in Christ, whose resurrection forms the τέλος. Thus we have two resurrections, probably (from ἄχρις οὗ in ver. 25, and from comparison of vers. 23, 26), separated by an interval—ὅταν with present subjunctive, instead of the aorist of the Receptus, is pure future, as opposed to future exact—so that the second resurrection is contemporaneous with the delivering of the kingdom to the Father. In ver. 27, ὅταν εἴπῃ must, as Meyer has shewn, be future exact, = when God pronounces the subjugation to be now accomplished. In ver. 28, ἵν' πᾶσιν is taken as neuter, and the sense is determined (with reference to 1 Cor. xii. 6; Eph. iv. 6; i. 23, &c.), to be the absolute realisation in the whole creation of the idea of the moral government of the universe. This again is understood as ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων, and confirmed by reference to ver. 26. Whether Paul means to include the devils does not appear; for if their personal annihilation were taught in ver. 24, we should have plurals, not singulars. Paul's teaching in other passages is compared with these results. It is admitted that 2 Thess. i. 9 gives an opposite doctrine. This difference is ascribed to the early date of the last-named epistle, and other discrepancies are put to the account of a want of system. Finally, a survey is given of the various views of expositors.

Among the shorter reviews, Nöldeke's notice of H. Strack's *Prolegomena Critica in V. T. Hebraicum*, deserves notice. The reviewer expresses well-grounded doubts of the genuineness of the alleged original MS. of Ben Asher at Aleppo. But however great these doubts, the matter ought to be looked to. Unfortunately this is one of the things which competent scholars are never rich enough to undertake. But the chief thing in the review is Nöldeke's adhesion to the doctrine of Lagarde and Olshausen, that all our MSS. of the Hebrew Bible spring from one archetype, and the proof which he offers, that the selection of a single MS. as normal, falls about the time of Christ. On the one hand, the Rabbis of the second century of our æra had forgotten the meaning of the *puncta extraordinaria*, &c.; on the other hand, the Book of Jubilees, of Jewish origin, in the last century before Christ, has a text often very different from the Masoretic.

In the fourth number we have an essay on 1 Peter, by Hilgenfeld, in which he defends the "old Tübingen" view of Schwegler and Baur, against the conservative view of Weiss, and the modified conservatism of Ewald and Grimm (cf. *B. and F. E. R.* 1873, p. 172) on the one hand, and against the still later date, proposed by Volkmar and Holtzmann on the other. Wittichen offers a new theory of the composition of Luke's gospel. We need not reproduce the complicated details of the hypothesis. In their present form, the critic sees in the writings ascribed to Luke, an early manifestation in the Roman Church of those efforts of a Judaising party, which culminated in the Clementine literature. Siegfried concludes his studies on Philo and the LXX., without any remarks on the results to be drawn from his researches. Dr Calinich in Hamburg, continues a controversy with Professor Zöckler, which has been going on for some years. The question is, whether the tenth article of the Augustana is capable of being taken in the sense of transubstantiation. The essayist maintains the affirmative. The point is interesting, as illustrating how far Melanchthon was prepared to go in the way of conciliation, although he certainly did not believe in transubstantiation himself. But in Germany the question has a factitious interest for the anti-unionist Lutheran party, which pins its faith to the *confessio invariata*; and, so far as one can judge, without having seen the other side of the controversy, it is this party interest which produces keen opposition to the view taken by Calinich. Rönsch, in a learned but most tedious paper, elucidates the name, friend of God, as applied to Abraham, by a fragment of Apollonious of Rhodes (*Eusebius Praep. Ev.* ix. 19), in which the name is interpreted πατρὸς φίλον. This etymology the critic supposes to have been commonly current among Hellenistic Jews, and to have originated in a confusion between רחם and חרם, giving as translation of the name, "the father loved him." This is interesting, but Rönsch cannot state the thing without giving nine other old etymologies of the name, and filling nearly eight pages. Finally, we mention a severe and thorough review of Heyse and Tischendorf's new edition of the Latin Bible, by Lic. K. Hamann, who is himself occupied with the Codex Amiatinus.

*Studien und Kritiken.* 1873. No. IV.

The number opens with a long paper by a Pfarrer W. Schmidt, on "The Freedom of the Will." Then follows a rambling exposition by Zyro, of Matt. xi. 12, to the effect that Christ having just placed John outside the kingdom, because he held the immutability of the Mosaic law (!), adds antithetically His condemnation of an opposite class, who, in a violent revolutionary manner, seek to pluck the fruit of the new dispensation prematurely, and so do violence to the idea of the kingdom. It may be doubted whether this exposition is worth the forty pages devoted to it. More interesting is the proposal of Märcker to take ἔργων νόμου in the Pauline epistles (Rom. iii. 20, 28 ; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2, 5, 10), as genitive of ἔργων νόμος (Cf. Rom. iii. 27). [For the emphatic position of the genitive, and absence of article therewith, might be cited Rom. xi. 13, ἔθνων ἀπόστολος.] This view is shewn to suit all the passages, and in Gal. iii. runs parallel with the correct rendering of ἀκοῆς πίστεως, as faith in the Gospel message heard (Cf. Rom. x. 16). In Rom. ix. 32, νόμου is spurious, so that this passage offers no instance against the very plausible view of the writer. Professor Brieger, in Halle, publishes an unknown letter of Kaiser Maximilian to Melanchthon. The letter is given from an official copy by the Chancellor of the Electorate of Saxony, and is accompanied by a note in his hand, which shews that the Kaiser—contrary to everything hitherto known—had been shewing favour to Flacius Illyricus. We close by directing attention to the careful and detailed criticism of Klostermann on Lagarde's edition of the Targum of Jonathan.

*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1873. Nos. II. and III.

An interesting and able essay on the Apostolic Council, by Professor Weizsäcker of Tübingen, discusses the relation between the account of this affair in Acts xv. and Galatians ii. The author, a moderate adherent of the more advanced criticism, finds essential points of difference between the two accounts. The Peter of Galatians could not have made the speech in Acts, and the proposal of James is inconsistent with Gal. ii. 6, which denies that the Apostles made any new proposal to Paul. The narrative of Galatians is understood to mean that Paul fought his battle at Jerusalem single-handed, with only negative result; that the Pillar-apostles indeed did not feel at liberty to take part against him; and that, personally, they were compelled to acknowledge the hand of God in his work, and gave him their fellowship, without carrying the whole Church with them. The writer of Acts is held to have had Galatians before him, and to have filled up the details, more or less, according to his own personal conceptions, arguing back from later custom, or principles later adopted by James. The result of course is, that the Acts must not be used as a source for the history of the controversy. This is not the place to go into a discussion of the matter, but the remark suggests itself that many of Weizsäcker's difficulties seem to fall away if the τὰ ἀναγκαῖα of Acts xv. 28 is taken to mean, necessary, not for salvation, but for harmony between Jews and Gentiles. If so, there is no real contradiction with Gal. ii. 6. We add that the commentary of Overbeck seems to have

made a great impression on Weizsäcker as well as on other critics, and that unfavourable judgments on Acts may be expected to become more numerous through the same influence.

Professor Gass has an essay on the moral value of Ascetic, *i.e.* of the means towards virtue. He gives a comprehensive historical sketch of the ascetic, both of the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches; adopts Rothe's view, which removes the subject from the doctrine of virtue, and gives it a place in a larger conception of the doctrine of duty, as embracing the whole course of moral growth, in the realisation of which practice has a necessary place. Hence ascesis is never a virtue: nor can any moral diet and gymnastic directly produce virtue. Yet such exercises are auxiliaries, necessary in education and self-discipline, but not to be carried on always, since operative morality and piety have for their end that which is free. The individual means towards virtue are defined nearly as by Rothe, whose system dominates the not very creative mind of the present occupant of his chair. Professor Gass's strength lies in the direction of history, and the historical sketch that introduces the article will be read with interest. A third essay, by the veteran Dr Sack, points out the importance of the doctrine of the miraculous conception of our Lord, and emphasises the responsibility of admitting into the pulpits of the church men who explain New Testament facts as myths. A few remarks are added on the question of subscription in general, and the writer still adheres to his old preference for a short creed over a loose signature. He sees, however, no fundamental objection to the acceptance of a solemn promise not to teach anything contrary to the miraculous events of the gospel history.

The third number contains no fewer than three lectures—a semi-popular one on Isaiah, by Düsterdieck; an unimportant discussion of the notion and significance of Dogma, by Professor Schmidt of Leipzig; and finally, the introductory oration by Professor Diestel, delivered at Tübingen in May last. The subject is the Hebrew historical literature; the standpoint is critical, with decided adherence to the old view of the place of the Elohist. The points in which the lecturer diverges from the current views of his school are, of course, not brought into much prominence, but the whole sketch of the growth of the historic literature of the Old Testament is well worth reading. An analysis of details would do no justice to the paper, and must therefore be omitted. Wagenmann recalls to the memory of his readers leading events in Church history in the year '73 of successive centuries. Finally, Lic: Th. Förster writes on Macarius the elder, of Egypt. The article forms quite an extensive monograph of sixty pages, and goes fully into the various phases of the mystical doctrine contained in the homilies of Macarius, which alone of his writings are to be accepted as genuine. The mysticism of Macarius is represented as much more thoroughly united to practical ethical tendencies than was usual in the East. In some respects—*e.g.* in the doctrine of sin—his doctrines have a distinct western colour, and the essayist places him in a relation of affinity to the better mystical teachers of the middle ages, and through them to the Reformation.

W. R. S.

# NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

## Philosophy and Theology.

*Handbook of Moral Philosophy.* By Rev. Henry Calderwood, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh. London: Macmillan & Co. 1872.

Professor Calderwood's "Handbook of Moral Philosophy" is worthy of the reputation which he enjoys as an able and successful teacher. Instead of putting into the hands of his students a work professing to be a compendious substitute for classic works in philosophy, he has wisely given them a guide-book specially intended to lead them to study such works for themselves. By doing so he has shewn a just appreciation of the value of an early acquaintance on the part of the philosophical student with those great writers from whom the enthusiasm of thought may be learned. The citations and references of Professor Calderwood shew a wide acquaintance with the philosophical literature of the world; and his manner of interweaving with his own expositions the most striking sayings of other philosophers greatly adds to the interest of the book. By saying so much regarding what we consider the special merit of his handbook, we do not mean to undervalue it as a work of independent exposition, although its necessary brevity makes it less satisfactory in this respect. Within the limits which he has assigned to himself, the author has given us "an exposition and defence of the intuitional theory of morals, with a criticism of utilitarianism," which will be found to be clear, interesting, and notably fair. J. G.

## Old Testament Exegesis.

*The True Text of the Old Testament, with some Remarks on the Language of the Jews.* By the Rev. James Brodie, A.M. Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter, & Co. 1873.

This volume contains the second and final instalment of the results of certain investigations which, Mr Brodie tells us, he was induced to commence by the publication of Sir Charles Lyell's work on the Antiquity of Man. Two subjects of inquiry presented themselves, viz., the credibility of the conclusions come to by geologists regarding the nature and antiquity of man; and, secondly, the reliability of the inferences drawn by Biblical critics from the Old Testament Scriptures.

Having subjected the first of these topics to careful consideration, Mr Brodie published his conclusions in a little work, entitled, "The Antiquity and Nature of Man, in Reply to Sir Charles Lyell;" and he now informs us that he has once and again solicited discussion, but has never succeeded in getting any one to reply. The fruits of his researches in the second proposed field of inquiry, are set forth in the volume before

us. The writer tells us, that after he had got on a little way, he became convinced that a far wider range of research was required than he had at first anticipated; and, further, that the results he was led to were so much at variance with some of his preconceived opinions, that he found it extremely difficult to come to a final decision. The reader will be able to understand Mr Brodie's feeling on both points, for many of his positions are undoubtedly surprising.

The book consists of two parts. The first is devoted to a discussion of the true text of the Old Testament. The second contains a dissertation on the language of the Jews. We shall give a brief statement of the author's leading conclusions, without entering into an examination of his arguments.

Having shown that Ezra's recension of Old Testament Scripture contained a faithful transcript of the original text, Mr Brodie proposes for discussion the question, whether the Hebrew text we possess or the Septuagint is to be considered the more accurate version of this standard? Holding that our Hebrew text is not derived direct from Ezra's recension, while the Septuagint is an accurate translation of it, he gives the palm to the latter. He supports this view by various lines of evidence—such as the discrepancies in language and in chronology—and urges, therefore, that the text of the LXX should be taken as the modern standard, while in his opinion the adoption of its chronology will obviate the objections which scientific and historical critics bring against the credibility of the early history of the Bible.

In the second part, which treats of the language of the Jews, the more important statements are as follows:—From Moses to Nehemiah the Hebrew language, owing to national peculiarities, remained, with few changes, essentially the same; and even after the captivity the Jews spoke Hebrew in purity. Further, in the time of Christ, the general language of the people was neither Greek nor Aramic, but pure Hebrew. Hence the quotations from the Old Testament in the gospels are not free citations from either the Septuagint or the Hebrew text now extant, but are accurate translations from the true original Hebrew text of Ezra's recension. This fact accounts for their divergence both from the LXX and from our Hebrew text; while, on the whole, they are nearer the former, just because it approximates most to the true text of Ezra.

These views Mr Brodie supports with various arguments, some of which are at least novel. While each reader must form his own estimate as to the success with which the author has established his peculiar views, we are certain all will unite in admiring his openness and candour, and in feeling grateful for the singular clearness and extreme brevity with which he has been able to state his opinions—qualities which are rarely met with in works of this description. W. G. E.

*Grammatical Analysis of the Hebrew Psalter.* By JOANA JULIA GRESWELL. Oxford: James Parker & Co. 1873.

The authoress, "fearing that it might be thought presumptuous in a lady to write a work intended to afford assistance to beginners in the study of Hebrew," has prefixed commendatory letters from Dr Perowne,

author of a creditable Commentary on the Psalms, and from the Dean of Canterbury, who, while disapproving in general of works intended to save trouble, considers that an exception ought to be made in favour of Hebrew, which is usually begun late in life, and therefore "thinks that our students, and the younger clergy generally, have reason to be very grateful to Miss Greswell, for producing a work which will make the acquisition of Hebrew so much more easy." While agreeing with Dr Payne Smith that the use of Miss G.'s book may be both justifiable and advantageous in the case of those who require to have Hebrew made easy, we must confess to a feeling of disappointment at learning that the students and junior clergy of the Church of England belong to this class. However, as we have no reason to impugn the Dean's estimate of the Hebraistic capabilities of his younger brethren, we can only join in congratulating the lady authoress on having been made the instrument of effecting so great an amelioration in the lot of such a distinguished body of men. The object of the book, as stated in the introduction, is to give a complete grammatical analysis, and a full lexical account of every word that occurs in the Book of Psalms. The latter part of this undertaking has been accomplished with a great degree of thoroughness and accuracy; but, on the other hand, the grammatical treatment is much too meagre, and there is a lamentable deficiency in the illustration of principles and the explanation of system. We regret also that Miss G. has adhered so closely to the authorised version; as, for instance, in constantly representing the Hebrew Imperfect by the English Future, where the sense is manifestly Present. It is perhaps well that she has in general abstained from critical and expository elucidation; for, where she does attempt this, she betrays a very feminine preference for fanciful interpretations. The arrangement is good, the printing unusually free from blunders, and the contents are rendered very accessible by a copious index. Persons who do not care to spend time hunting for words in a lexicon, will find in Miss G.'s book a very complete vocabulary to the Book of Psalms, containing much philological information, combined with a grammatical reference of each word to its root; while they must be content to look elsewhere for an exhibition of the underlying principles of inflection and syntax. W. G. E.

## New Testament Exegesis.

*Das Neue Testament Tertullian's reconstruirt, mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen textkrit. und sprachl. Inhalts.* [*Tertullian's New Testament reconstructed, with Introductions and Notes on Matters of Textual Criticism and Language.*] By Hermann Rönsch. Leipsic. 1871.

However doubtful in some respects the gains may be which are yielded by the study of the patristic literature, the services which these ancient writings are capable of rendering in the department of textual criticism admit of no question. It is well known with what emphasis Lachmann, for instance, insisted on the peculiar importance of quotations

from the Fathers for these purposes; and it is long since Griesbach pointed out the uncertainty which attaches not only to our decisions for or against individual readings, but also to many of our conclusions on the whole subject of the sources, character, and relationships of the great recensions, until we have at our disposal richer and more careful excerpts from the earliest authors. The high value of these citations, and the necessity of being provided with complete and trustworthy critical collations of them, are matters now generally acknowledged. In this line of evidence, too, Tertullian occupies so prominent a place, that it is not too much to claim for him the first position, in this point of view, among all the fathers of the Latin Church. This is due in part, of course, to his more ancient date, but largely also to the singular wealth and variety of the quotations occurring in his works. Hence it has long been felt to be a loss to sacred criticism that there has been no thorough and systematic disposition made of the copious materials thus lying to our hands in the writings of the illustrious Carthaginian. Among the confessed authorities in textual studies Lachmann may again be named as one who perceived this defect most clearly, and lamented it most sincerely. And it is this want which is at length sought to be supplied in a reliable and scientific method in the composition now before us.

For the successful discharge of this laborious enterprise, the author is peculiarly well fitted. Herr Rönsch's previous investigations in the field of the early versions, the chief fruit of which is found in his admirable treatise entitled *Itala und Vulgata*, have been an excellent training for this new effort. And what he has here aimed at has been accomplished in a very painstaking, accurate, and serviceable fashion. The volume is intended to present us with a reconstruction of Tertullian's New Testament. Its object, in other words, is to collect, critically examine, and classify all the texts made use of by the great African leader, so that we may see the old Latin version as nearly as possible in the form in which it appeared in his day. This onerous task of bringing together and arranging in their proper order all the citations which are to be met with in the whole range of this Father's writings, has been most honourably discharged. The edition followed in the main is that by Oehler, the long-promised revision of the text which has been preparing under the auspices of the Vienna Academy being unfortunately not yet available. In carrying out his plan the author also draws a very careful distinction between direct and indirect quotations, the entire mass being marked off, under the one head or the other, in two parallel columns. In this way two great *tableaux* are set before us, exhibiting all the passages for which Tertullian's testimony may be adduced. And the result is, that we may be said to be furnished with the nearest attainable approach to a reproduction of the New Testament, in the style and with the readings in which it was known to the Christians of the Latin Church in the end of the second century and the beginning of the third.

His more immediate object has naturally led the writer also to consider for himself the great questions which have been stirred with regard to Tertullian's life and literary history. The results of these inquiries are given in an introduction, consisting of a series of chapters on Tertullian's

biography, the genuineness of the various compositions ascribed to him, the dates and successions of his accredited works, &c. These sections contain much that is interesting. A very ample synopsis, for example, is offered of the different designations employed by this Father for holy Scripture. Many of these are at once characteristic and picturesque. Thus we have *divinum instrumentum, sancta digesta, sancti commentarii, sacrosanctus stilus, instrumentum literaturæ, instrumentum prædicationis*, and various others. The term *instrumentum* in particular, which appears so frequently in Tertullian's writings, is worthy of notice, as Rönsch observes, on account of its remarkable accordance with the language of the forum, and its technical sense in Roman law. The main facts in his life, his early profession as an advocate or jurist, the method in which he became a Christian, his marriage, his appointment to the office of presbyter at Carthage, the occasion of his joining the camp of the Montanists, and the most notable events in his subsequent career, are all detailed precisely as they are gathered from his own statements. The examination of the genuineness of the different compositions bearing Tertullian's name is concise but thorough. The general conclusion is, that of the mass of writings ascribed to him either by himself or by others, some eleven are no longer extant, while six are, in all likelihood, spurious, viz., the *Adversus omnes haereses*, which used to be appended as a kind of *finale* to the genuine treatise entitled *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, and the five pieces known as the *De Jona propheta, Sodoma, Genesis, De Judicio Domini*, and *Adversus Marcionem libri quinque*. Into the difficult question regarding the chronological succession of Tertullian's works, Herr Rönsch enters with some minuteness. He reviews the several classifications adopted by Neander, Nösselt, and others. But on the whole, while appreciating the merits possessed by these as elaborate attempts at establishing a system, he admits their insecurity, and agrees more nearly with our own British investigator, Kaye, Bishop of Lincoln, contenting himself with arranging just so many of the books as present materials for the verification of their order in Tertullian himself. Thus he shews, for example, how the *Apologeticus* preceded the *De Testimonio animae*, and the *De Corona* was written before the *De Fuga*, &c. There is also a very careful criticism of the peculiarities of Tertullian's style,—that style at once so irregular and hard to unravel, and yet so singularly vigorous, happily characterized by Balzac as resembling the ebony, dark but gleaming. Noticing the best of the older verdicts upon this subject, Herr Rönsch himself exhibits very clearly its pronounced juridical character, and holds the language to be an amalgam of legal, ecclesiastical, and popular terms, with a strong Punic element pervading the whole. Another portion of the book specially deserving attention is the vigorous defence made of the *Apologeticus*. The theory of its dependence upon the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix is controverted, the views advocated by Ebert in the treatise entitled *Tertullian's Verhältniss zu Minucius Felix* (Leipsic, 1868) are subjected to a very searching discussion, and weighty considerations are adduced disproving the idea that the frequent resemblances between these two compositions are to be explained on the supposition that the *Octavius* was prior to the *Apolo-*

*geticus*, and that in preparing the latter Tertullian incorporated not a little of the matter ready for his use in the former.

A survey of the tables of texts might present many readings at once remarkable and important. Among others, we may mention the following:—*Tempus in collecto est*, 1 Cor. vii. 29; *uti e contrario magis vos donare et advocare*, 2 Cor. ii. 7; *mundialium elementorum derogationem*, where the *derogatio* occurs probably in its technical sense in Roman law, Gal. iv. 9; *ultra solis receptum*, perhaps with reference to the Alexandrine version of Psalm xix. 6–7, Eph. iv. 26; *brabium angelicæ substantiæ*, Phil. iii. 14; *cavendum a subtililoquentia*, Col. ii. 4; *ne expavescatis lustionem*, 1 Pet. iv. 12.

There are, of course, certain things ventured on in the book to which exception may fairly be taken, particularly some of the positions affirmed in the chronology of Tertullian's life. But the work, as a whole, is eminently deserving of commendation. As a painstaking, inductive study of an ancient text, it will be of real value to the Biblical critic, and it is precisely one of these patient and genuinely scientific efforts which will contribute largely to give greater certitude to our knowledge of the early versions. S. D. F. S.

*The Words of the New Testament, as altered by Transmission, and ascertained by Modern Criticism, for popular use.* By Rev. WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., and Rev. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1873.

We should be glad to believe, with the authors of this little book, that non-professional students of their English New Testament feel so strong and general an interest in the integrity of the sacred text as to crave the aid of a help like this. If a popular handbook to Biblical criticism be "a strongly-felt want," the prospects of theology in this country are better than we imagined. In that case, too, the authors will find their reward in a wide circulation. The first part of the volume describing the sources of textual criticism, which is done, and very well done, too, by Professor Roberts, may be found of interest to readers of ordinary literary taste; but the second part (by Professor Milligan) being more technical, will, we fear, be dry to non-scientific readers, while to students it is too elementary to be valuable.

As to the rest of the book, giving important changes of reading, it would take a deal of resolute patience for an ordinary Christian to go through his Testament and note them all. It may also be said that such as wish for that kind of help have already something similar in Tischendorf's English Testament (Tauchnitz), and Dean Alford's Testament for English Readers. Still, the mere publication of such aids to the exact study of the New Testament by those who are ignorant of Greek, may serve to develop a taste for that study in thoughtful Christians; and whatever goes to familiarize the laity with the surest results of biblical scholarship, whether in the form of a corrected text or of a corrected rendering, is, at all events, paving the way for a readier acceptance of the new revised translation when it appears.

CHURCH HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

*Religious Thought in England, from the Reformation to the End of Last Century. A Contribution to the History of Theology.* By the Rev. JOHN HUNT, M.A. Vol. III. Strahan & Co., London. 1873.

This is the third and concluding instalment of a work whose excellent design and painstaking execution we have already mentioned with praise. It is the most interesting of the three, as in the concluding survey the author puts us in possession more fully of the theological stand-point from which the history has been written. Mr Hunt is a Broad-Churchman; but as he tells us in his preface, he has endeavoured to write, not in the spirit of a partisan, but simply as an impartial chronicler. "I have not," he says, "abused those from whom I differ, and I have not exalted those with whom I agree." He claims no more than is due to him, when he says that he has endeavoured to speak with fairness of men of all parties; and when compared with a writer like Dean Hook, the contrast is sufficiently remarkable. At the same time, Mr Hunt's success has not been complete. Some writers appear greater than they ought in his pages, and others more contemptible, or at all events less venerable, than is their right; but this arises from no conscious intention on his part to do injustice, but simply because he is better able to appreciate those religious thinkers, who may be called rational, to use an inoffensive expression, than those, whether evangelical or high-church, who give a large place to mystery in their conception of Christianity. His sympathy is evidently stronger with the seeker after truth than with him who quietly and trustfully reposes upon truth found; and he has much good to say even of the Deists, certainly more than of the high-churchmen. One of the most interesting portions of this volume is devoted to Hume, for whose wonderful acuteness and brilliancy he has an unbounded admiration. He calls him "the most sagacious of all Deists, as Bolingbroke was the most worthless." He admits, however, that his mind was essentially pagan, "without one Shemitic element." Only two references to scripture are to be found in the whole compass of his voluminous writings, and one of them is to the treasures of Hezekiah, and is introduced with the indifferent words, "if I remember right." Once, and once only, in the course of his life, and that was on the death of his mother, did he manifest any religious feeling. But slight as Mr Hunt admits Mr Hume's religious spirit to have been, he is filled with admiration for "the calm and self-possessed spirit which bore the opposition with meekness and patience."

For the whole of the eighteenth century the author of this book has more regard than is customary now. Evangelicalism and Romanticism have rendered the memory of "the age of reason" almost hateful. Mr Hunt is disposed to defend it as the golden age of English practical common sense, when superstition and fanaticism were for a time driven out of the world. But he is too honest not to admit the faults of his favourite epoch, and it would be difficult for its worst enemy to say anything more damaging. It was an age, he says, when the tone of the public mind was

frivolous and superficial, when its philosophy was shallow, when the common people were ignorant and profane, and when "religion was more defended than practised." Now, if the result of "the cultivation of the spirit of inquiry" is to make society frivolous, philosophy shallow, and people profane, such inquiry is scarcely to be desired in the interests of mankind. Mr Hunt has a profound regard for mental honesty, and hence the kindness with which he speaks of those who openly question what others are contented to disbelieve in private. The frank sceptic or heretic certainly deserves more honour than the orthodox dissembler; but there is a tendency with those who try everything by the tests of dry, cold reason, to regard all as fools and fanatics who declare they have a vision beyond the ken of logic. The vision may be real, though the critic cannot see it. It is certainly dishonest to profess to see what we do not see; but we are not to deny a true vision even for the sake of getting credit for mental honesty.

We do not fully understand what Mr Hunt's language means regarding the great Arian controversy at the close of the eighteenth century. "The Triad of being," he writes, "which in the first conception of the Trinity was an obvious doctrine of reason and philosophy, had become a mere contradiction, which Christians were to believe on external authority." Arianism was, according to Mr Hunt, and we agree with him, an impossible compromise, and he adds, "the doctrine of Christ's simple humanity was the only tenable position for those who could not see the Trinity in a rational light." We cannot say that a triad of being in the divine nature has at any time appeared to us "an obvious doctrine of reason and philosophy;" for although not irrational, it is a doctrine which faith may accept as revealed, but which reason cannot certainly discover. Mr Hunt's book is a history of theology and not of religious life, consequently little is said in it about the great evangelical movement in the Church, and the Methodist revival outside. There is, however, a brief but clever, and by no means unfair, reference to the Methodists. They are described as the new foe which met the orthodox champions of Christianity returning from the slaughter of the Arians and the Deists. Dr Waterland wrote against them as "the new enthusiasts;" Butler told them that belief in the immediate guidance of God's Spirit was "a horrid thing—a very horrid thing;" and Bishop Warburton indignantly denied that the rural population of England were sitting in darkness and the shadow of death, as Wesley and Whitefield said, because they were not pagans but baptized Christians. Bishop Gibson, in one of his pastorals, classed the Methodists with Papists and Deists and other disturbers of the kingdom of God. Their treatment of the Methodists, Mr Hunt justly says, will ever be a reproach to the orthodox Christians of the eighteenth century. The cause of it he ascribes to the fact, that they maintained a theory of the Church set aside at the Reformation, which they themselves only vaguely believed, and which the Methodists practically refuted. "There was no liberty of prophesying, and most of the clergy acted on the belief that no man could do any good except according to the order of the Church." We doubt if this is a complete explanation of the dislike of earnest Methodism by the divines of the eighteenth century, but it may certainly be accepted as one reason. Mr

Hunt promises that a history of religious life will in due time follow his history of religious thought, in which he will exhibit "the catholicism of religion rather than the sectarianism of theology." We shall not promise to agree with Mr Hunt's views, but we shall certainly welcome the information collected by so honest and painstaking an historian. J. G.

*In the Morning Land; or, The Law of the Origin and Transformation of Christianity.* By JOHN S. STUART GLENNIE, M.A. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, & Co.

The object of this work is to overthrow the Christian theory of history, to discover an ultimate law of history, and to verify the law by explaining the origin of the Christian religion. At the outset, it is fair to say that Mr Glennie has not undertaken so great a task without laborious thought and study. He has clearly been at pains to read the best authorities on the subjects he touches; and he informs us that the present volume has been almost entirely re-written. The style of the book is fluent and vigorous, and sometimes, as in the descriptive parts, really eloquent. We should think that Mr Glennie might write a vivid and attractive narrative of his travels. But his powers as a philosopher are more doubtful.

Of the part of the book in which he attempts to refute the historical theory of Christianity, it has to be said, that the author is successful neither in stating nor in overthrowing the theory he attempts to discredit. A few scornful sentences on miracles, mixed with much irrelevant matter, will scarcely be deemed sufficient. It is truly amazing to find a man of Mr Glennie's culture thinking that the argument for miracles is to be overthrown by the fact that the belief in miracles is a necessary product of the earlier stages of culture. This is merely the familiar truism that miracles require to be supported by stronger evidence than ordinary events—a truism which every writer on the subject has been as well aware of as Mr Glennie. It may not have been stated in the manner which the publication of such books as Mr Tylor's overrated work on "Primitive Culture" may now demand; but the mere form of the statement is unimportant. In short, it is evident that Mr Glennie relies upon the present scientific unbelief as a sufficient justification of itself. To a keener student of history, the ways of thinking of the present generation would have seemed a slender reason for such shrill triumph. We must do Mr Glennie the justice of saying, that his sketch of the history of the search for a law of history is interesting, though like other parts of the book at times disfigured by an offensive arrogance and dogmatism. His defence of the possibility of a science of history against Froude and Kingsley is also satisfactory, though the main points have already been sufficiently stated by Spencer.

Of the second part, in which the author attempts to discover an ultimate law of history by a reconciliation of the principles of Hegel and Comte, we desire to speak with more diffidence. The language which Mr Glennie employs is frequently difficult, and we are doubtful if we have succeeded in understanding all the author's principles. He at least

deserves the credit which can so rarely be given to English writers of having a first-hand acquaintance with the writings of Hegel and Comte; and it is unquestionable that the deduction of his law is accomplished with considerable metaphysical acumen. We own however to more than a suspicion that Mr Glennie's elaborate terminology often conceals a very common-place meaning, and that his discovery is of considerably less importance than he fancies. But we refrain from expressing a more decided opinion till the author has more clearly and fully explained his views.

The last part of the book is the weakest, and even the uninstructed reader will not find it difficult to see through its fallacies. It consists mainly of a wild attempt to connect Osirianism with Christianity. Mr Glennie scarcely attempts to define Christianity; and has a very inadequate conception of the magnitude of the problem he has to solve in accounting for its origin. He adopts in the most reckless way any statement, however extravagant, which seems to militate against Christianity—such as the assertions of Deutsch in his "Talmud" article on the connection of Christ's teachings with the Talmud. The problem of the rising of so harmonious a moral code as our Lord taught from the disharmony of a Jewish peasant household, the unique accordance of His life with His teachings, the unparalleled consistency with which the evangelists record His sinless doings—are scarcely faced by Mr Glennie. We could wish that such powers as this book proves him to possess were more worthily employed. Nothing that he has said overthrows our conviction that the "one purpose of history is the purpose of everlasting love worked out, in and through human personality, by a personal redeeming God."

W. R. N.

### Devotional and Practical.

*Selections from the Poems of Charlotte Elliott, author of "Just as I am."* With a Memoir by her Sister, E. B. Religious Tract Society. 1873.

There are two hymns of modern times which, more than others, have touched the heart of the Church of Christ, and which are sung with one accord by its universal voice. Heber's missionary hymn, and Charlotte Elliott's "Just as I am," may be put side by side as illustrating, the one the Church's outer work, the other the personal dealing of an individual soul with Christ. The lives of the authors were also typical. To Heber in the midst of his zealous and devoted work the end came sharp and sudden; while Miss Elliott's life of saintly seclusion was prolonged far beyond the usual span.

Born and educated in a religious circle, some of whose members are among the ornaments of the English Church, as Cunningham of Harrow, Venn of Huddersfield, and Bishop Shirley, Miss Elliott's early life, we are told, was less remarkable for piety than for "unusual powers of conversation, high intellectual capacity, and zest for every interesting subject." At the age of thirty, during a severe and prolonged illness, she became deeply conscious of the evil in her own heart, and having not yet fully realised the fulness and freeness of the grace of God in Jesus

Christ, she suffered much mental distress under the painful uncertainty whether it were possible that such a one as she felt herself to be could be saved. It was to Cæsar Malan, of Geneva, that, like Dr John Duncan, a person of very different character and temperament, she owed "the birthday of her soul;" and perhaps the most valuable part of the memoir is a letter from Dr Malan written to Miss Elliott and her sister after this event. From this time her life was one of feeble health, and of devotion to God. Unfortunately, she adopted the idea that anything which overstepped the factitious limits of religion laid down by the Evangelical party must be more or less wrong, and her fine poetical powers thus degenerated too much into addresses to friends and sermons in rhyme. No doubt many sweet and graceful verses will be found among her pieces; but they are generally feeble compared with the one placed, as if it were her monument, at the beginning of the book, and two others equally familiar: "O holy Saviour, Friend unseen!" and "Thy will be done." She did not acknowledge that the Spirit who bestows a gift can sanctify it, and therefore refused for her poetry that culture and human sympathy which would have made it of wider influence, restraining it in the conventual spirit to prayer and meditation alone. It is this tendency of the high evangelicalism of the English Church which has made it so distasteful to many minds, and probably helped to open the door to the more apparent warmth and activity of Ritualism. This will also make Miss Elliott's poems and memoir, though intensely interesting to those who knew her, and to Christian hearts who loved her unknown, of narrower circulation and influence than otherwise they would have deserved to be. For twenty-five years Miss Elliott edited the *Christian Remembrancer*. In her invalid seclusion she searched the Scriptures for the precious texts which composed it, and wrote many of the hymns which enriched its pages. Its sale was large, and she devoted the profits to charitable purposes. Another congenial task was the re-arranging of the "Invalid's Hymn Book," for which she wrote 112 new hymns, and which has now reached its eighteenth thousand. Always cheerful, loving, and considerate, from her sick-room went forth an influence which soothed many a struggling soul, helped many a young disciple, and inspired many a zealous Christian. She died on the 22d of September 1871, the day for which her text was, "Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off."

E. M. M.

*The Self-Interpreting Bible.* By the Rev. JOHN BROWN, of Haddington. Edited, with many Thousand Additional Notes, by the Rev. HENRY COOKE, D.D., LL.D., President, Assembly College, Belfast, and Re-Edited, with considerable Additions, by the Rev. J. L. PORTER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism, Belfast. London: Blackie & Son.

The name of John Brown, of Haddington, is familiar in the homes of Scotland. It is one of the honoured names around which there lingers a

sacred halo. As a minister of the Secession Church, and as a Professor of Divinity in connection with that denomination, he wielded a remarkable influence, both directly and indirectly, in sustaining and diffusing Evangelical life in Scotland, at a time when the blight of Moderatism had fallen on the Established Church. As a preacher of the Gospel he was noted for his solemn earnestness. Hume, who on one occasion heard him preach at North Berwick, said of him, "That old man preaches as if Christ were at his elbow." This was a fitting description of his manner. But especially as an author he exerted a powerful influence on the tendencies of religious thought and feeling in the times in which he lived. That influence has not ceased, though eighty-six years have passed away since he was laid in his grave. His most important works were his "System of Divinity," "Dictionary of the Bible"—still unquestionably the most valuable work of the kind for popular use—and his "Self-Interpreting Bible," which was first published in 1778. This Commentary has been frequently re-published, and has long held a place in public estimation, unapproached by any other work of the kind. It is, in the best sense of the word, a *popular* Commentary. The venerable author was an indefatigable student, and an able expounder of the Word of God. Designed for circulation originally among the intelligent peasantry of Scotland, the author does not enter into critical details, nor does he sermonise, after the manner of Henry, but in a few pregnant sentences presents the import and practical bearings of the passages commented upon, in such a way as to excite and quicken the devotional feelings of the reader. The edition of this work, which has just been issued by the Messrs Blackie & Son, is greatly enriched by the labours of Dr Cooke, and his son-in-law, Dr Porter. Dr Cooke added many thousand notes, embodying in brief compass comprehensive views of the truth, dealing especially with the principles that reconcile seemingly conflicting passages. Dr Porter has more particularly given his attention to textual and expository criticism, and by judiciously condensed notes, he puts the reader in possession of the best fruits of modern critical research, and of geographical and scientific discovery, in so far as they bear on the illustration of the Word of God. In this department of Biblical study, Dr Porter has long held an honoured place. His separate works, as well as his numerous contributions to the great theological cyclopædias and quarterlies, shew his qualifications for this work, which he has now happily completed.

There is no lack of commentaries on the Scriptures in these days, and it is a happy sign of the times that such works are in demand; but we know of no single commentary to be more worthily recommended as a household book than this edition of Brown's "Self-Interpreting Bible." It is pre-eminently a book for the family,—a book no one can refer to without obtaining a clearer insight into the meaning of the Sacred Record, and at the same time deriving from it spiritual quickening.

We need not say that, so far as regards the mechanical execution of the work, it is all that could be desired. It is beautiful as a specimen of clear, well-arranged typography, and is altogether a magnificent volume.

M. G. E.

MISCELLANEOUS.

*The Land of Moab: Travels and Discoveries on the East Side of the Dead Sea and the Jordan.* By H. B. TRISTRAM, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., &c. London: Murray. 1873.

We have found this a fascinating volume. To begin with, it is a capital book of travels. Fresh, lively, full of adventure among strange folk in a nearly unknown territory, it is written by an intelligent and accomplished gentleman, who describes well and writes good English. But, over and above this, it really adds a good deal to our knowledge of Scripture sites on the east of the Dead Sea. It is pretty generally known that our own "Palestine Exploration Society" and the American one have divided between them the allotments of the ten tribes, the transjordanic portion falling to our transatlantic friends. Dr Tristram hints in his preface, that his projected invasion of Moab was discouraged by the Palestine Exploration Fund as almost an invasion of the right of their American allies. Nevertheless, we are glad that he and his party went. Enough remains to be done by a more thorough and systematic search; possibly such a search may be the more thorough, because this preliminary raid has broken ground, and shewn us what to look for and to find. Dr Tristram's party had the great advantage of being escorted by the Bedawin tribe—the Beni Sakk'r—which is the real superior of the Moabite territory, as well as the valuable aid of Mr Klein (of the Church Missionary Society) from Jerusalem during the earlier and more difficult part of their route. With these advantages, they succeeded in exploring the nearly inaccessible fortress city of Kerak, so important an outpost in the crusading wars; they visited the hot sulphur springs in the romantic gorge of the Callirrhoe, resorted to by Herod the Great for medicinal baths, and have given us a fuller description of that curious spot than previously existed; they identified the site of the castle of Machærus, if not the very dungeon where John the Baptist was beheaded; they seem to have fixed the date of the Biblical Zoar with a large measure of probability at Ziàra, on the Nebo range overlooking the *ghor* of the Jordan,—an identification which, if sustained, will demonstrate that the cities of the plain occupied the level space to the *north* of the Dead Sea, where the river enters it; and finally, they discovered an unfinished palace of great architectural interest and beauty, which Mr Fergusson conjectures to have been designed as a hunting-seat for the Persian Napoleon of the seventh century, Chosroes II. The volume also abounds in notices of the past and present state of the Moabite territory, and of its biblical cities. Its rolling pasture downs; its endless cisterns, open or subterranean; its ruined towns, each on its isolated mamelon of rock; its water-courses, beginning in shallow depressions in the plateau, but ending in tremendous ravines cleaving through the western face of the mountain a passage to the Dead Sea; its dolmens, tumuli, and standing monoliths, traces of unknown primeval inhabitants;—on all these points, as well as on its botany and ornithology Dr Tristram has something to tell which is new and valuable. He writes, too, as might be expected, in

a Christian tone, which forms a pleasant contrast to Captain Burton's recent volume on the country further north. J. O. D.

*Essays on the Rise and Progress of the Christian Religion in the West of Europe, from the Reign of Tiberius to the End of the Council of Trent.* By JOHN (Earl) RUSSELL. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1873.

The proverbial courage of the veteran Whig leader receives fresh illustration from this latest work of his pen. No one will go to Lord Russell's pages with any hope to find there either the fruit of original research into Church History, or fresh theories to explain known facts. As historical essays, these are sufficiently flimsy in structure. The noble author is frank enough to tell us in his preface that he relies on Milman and Jortin; so we know what we have to expect. But he is a practised writer as well as a fairly-read man of culture; and the book is readable for its style and for its side allusions. Its real interest, however, is a biographical one. It may be taken to be Earl Russell's confession of faith; and as the public are, now-a-days, in spite of its ignorance of theology, or even contempt for it, fascinated by the subject, and eager for all sorts of theological opinions, however crude, the theological utterances of great statesmen are sure of a wide hearing.

Earl Russell, then, is a very Broad Christian, of the Matthew Arnold type. He thinks that Christianity began to be corrupted by speculation into matters beyond our reason, when the Greek divines undertook to define the person of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. Whether Lord Russell himself accepts of our Lord's divinity seems to be left doubtful. His favourite text on the subject is, "My Father is greater than I;" and in one place (p. 66) he speaks of Him as liable to the "failings of a human being." But what he insists on with greatest frequency and force is, that in the lessons of Christ Himself, the practical duties of life hold a vastly more essential and prominent place than in later systems of theology. Christ, he says, taught that for the ninety-nine out of every hundred no repentance is required, heaven being won by their own righteousness; to the "one" sinner pardon is promised on his repentance and reformation (pp. 15, 16). With this view of the Master's teaching, he contends that Paul is quite consistent when properly understood; but then he understands Paul as Mr Matthew Arnold does. This is simplifying Christianity with a vengeance; only it is just the old-fashioned "simplicity" of Socinianism under a new dress. When you have struck out of Christian theology the Trinity, the Person of Christ, the Decrees of God, the Atonement, and the Doctrine of Regeneration, you have a residuum which it may be fashionable to call, with Earl Russell, "simple and sublime," but which all past experience shews to have lost whatever is vital in the Christian faith—whatever makes Christianity to be Christianity. Between this emasculated gospel —this baptised Deism—and the revived "Catholicism" of the sacerdotalists, it looks as if the Church of England would have to make her election, and that speedily. Earl Russell says (p. 342) these differences

are not "of vital importance." Unfortunately for the easy optimism with which his school surveys the "Christian latitudinarianism" of the English Church, there are a good many Christians who still think otherwise.

J. O. D.

*The Friendship of Books and other Lectures.* By the Rev. F. D. MAURICE. Edited with a Preface by T. HUGHES, M.P. London: Macmillan & Co. 1874.

The lectures here brought together are on various literary subjects, and were delivered at different times and to different audiences. They will be read with much interest, and even those who do not agree with Mr Maurice's theological views, will admire the indefatigable zeal and energy which he displayed in all social and educational movements. The lecture from which the collection takes its title, "On the Friendship of Books," is well worthy of its prominent place in the volume, though we should not be inclined to think it the best. It is a subtle and genial review of some of our greatest English books and authors, with the view of shewing that a book should only be praised when it ceases to be to a man "a mere collection of letters and leaves, and becomes a friend."

In the lecture "On Books," Mr Maurice has throughout one aim—to teach that books are only valuable so long as they record the real thoughts, actions, and sufferings of men and women, and help us to know, with more thorough and true sympathy, ourselves and our fellows. This is the test to which he puts all books; if they bear it, they have a living and lasting influence over men; if not, they are doomed to speedy oblivion. This being so, it follows that the times which give birth to great books, are those stirring periods in which men's deepest passions and most elevating hopes are excited. "Great poems," he says, "are composed not in easy, lazy times, but when there is most work doing, and when there are the most strong and energetic men to do it." For the purpose of illustrating and proving this main principle, he passes in review some of the great names in English literature. After speaking of the burning of the Alexandrian Library, and what led to it, he traces the rise of the Saxon literature, and from King Alfred of our nation's literature. "Here," he says, "is the starting point of our nation's literature; . . . it does not begin from some learned schoolman; it does not begin from some condescending monarch, who patronises learned schoolmen, because he hopes that they will magnify and hand down his name to after ages; its origin is from a king who is a man of toil and sorrow." From that "glorious dawn of literature and of civilisation," he leads us through the subsequent great periods of English literature, making each one teach the same lesson, varying only in the greater or less directness and energy with which it is taught. From each period the books that have come down to us are those which connect themselves with human life and action.

All the lectures have one notable characteristic to which they owe a great deal of their power. Neither in the style, nor in the thought, nor in the facts and illustrations selected, is there any dissipation or indirectness. There is in each a principle to be illustrated and developed, a

moral to be taught; and this principle or moral is never lost sight of. In none of the lectures is this clear, firm "grip" which Mr Maurice takes of his subject so apparent as in the lecture on "Christian Civilisation," which we think is the best in the book. Here, as elsewhere, he never loses sight of the one truth, to which every fact in history testifies —the actual constant presence of Divine power directing every event, and making everything contribute to the development and blessing of the nations. But in the lecture on "Christian Civilisation," this truth is worked out in detail; the progress of civilisation is traced with fine historical insight; the causes and conditions of its growth are analysed. Civilisation Mr Maurice defines as "whatever helps to make citizens, to give them the qualities that appertain to citizens, to bring them into a better apprehension of their position as citizens, to prevent that position from becoming an untenable one." But although it is true that "whatever contributes to make our life as citizens a really tenable healthful life must be good," yet there are sometimes causes which operate to make men citizens before they have passed through the needful preparation for being citizens. These causes are shut out from the definition of healthful and progressive civilisation, by the addition of the adjective 'Christian." Starting from this, Mr Maurice goes to the Bible for "the ground of civilisation and the cause of civilisation," which is that every step of progress in family and national life must be founded upon the revelation of God, "as the absolute Being, the Guide of their heart; the Originator as well as the Object of their worship, whose will all lawgivers, priests, judges, were appointed to execute." He contrasts the different ideals embodied in their gods by the fierce Assyrians, the massive and serene Egyptians, the vivacious and intellectual Greeks, and the strong lawloving Romans, narrowed as each was to suit the tendencies and character of the nation which adopted it, with the spiritual ideal of the Jews, from which alone could any universal principle as a basis for society and civilisation be gained. The historical outline of the men and times and ideas to which England owes her civilisation is remarkably clear, and full of the deepest lessons. The introduction of the hollow and corrupt Roman civilisation by Julius Cæsar; its expulsion by the Saxons, and the establishment of their barbarous but pure and vigorous society in its place; the change which was worked in that society when the Message of Peace came a second time to our shores; its corruption by ecclesiasticism and the restoration of its purity by King Alfred, who is one of Mr Maurice's favourite heroes; the struggle between the civilisation of Christendom and that of Mahomet; the influence for good and evil of the feudal system; the rise of the middle classes and of the social system fostered by their guilds and cities, not wholly supplanting but existing side by side with the feudal system, the Reformation, the civil war, the foundation of the New England colonies—all these are reviewed, and the influence of each on the progress of Christian civilisation described with a true appreciation of their historical value.

Mr Maurice judges men and estimates their influence, not so much by what they do, as by what they are. In the lectures on "Milton" and on "Burke," he leads us through their writings and lives, not to admire

their learning and genius, or to seek there support for any special doctrine, but for the example which their labours and sufferings yield. He regards them first of all as men; he searches "Paradise Lost" for passages which will tell something about the personal life of Milton. The worth of their lives, as of all great men's lives to us, is that they shew examples of men who have struggled bravely and successfully through the toils, sufferings, inconsistencies, and sorrows of this life. The influence of such lives is strong and abiding, equally useful now in its own place and manner as when these men were alive. Speaking of Wordsworth's sonnet, commencing "Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour," Mr Maurice is not inclined so to wish the course of Providence altered. "I believe," he says, "that he appeared in the hour that was best for him and for us; that he represented his own time; that his work should be to awaken the hearts and energies of men who may represent ours. And I believe that, in the truest sense, he and all men who have served their generation and are fallen asleep, are living at this hour; that they are with us as witnesses of our acts and our failures, to reprove us if we are selfish men, to encourage us to walk in cheerful godliness, and to shew us how our souls may 'dwell apart' from the evils of our time, how we may lay upon ourselves whatever lowly duties it demands of us." G. S. G.

*Catholic Thoughts on the Church of Christ and the Church of England.* By the late FREDERICK MYERS, M.A. London: W. Isbister & Co.

The author of this book, a minister of the Church of England, died in his prime more than twenty years ago. A small volume of his sermons, which came into our hands soon after his decease, gave us such an impression of rare intellectual power, united to a yet rarer elevation and gentleness of Christian spirit, that we inquired anxiously after his other writings. We found, to our surprise, that the four University sermons, and a volume of week-day lectures on great men, were the only published products of his pen. It now appears that he had devoted the leisure of the earlier years of his too brief ministry to the preparation of this and a kindred volume, entitled "Catholic Thoughts on the Bible and Theology," which will shortly be published. The present volume was begun in 1834, when the author was but twenty-three years old, and after undergoing reconsideration and revision from time to time, it was printed for private circulation in 1841. A copy having fallen into the hands of the late Bishop Ewing, he wisely thought that it deserved to be more widely known; and having obtained the consent of the representatives of Mr Myers, he had made arrangements, previous to his last illness, for including it in the series of "Present Day Papers" on doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions, issued by him at intervals during recent years.

It seems somewhat unaccountable to us that a book containing so much powerful and suggestive thought on the ecclesiastical questions that have been agitating England for more than forty years, should have been so long withheld from publication; and we regret that it should now be introduced to the public burdened with an association which may awaken a pre-

liminary prejudice in a large number of the class of readers to whom it appeals.

In the year 1834, when the Oxford "revival" was in the full swing of its vigorous youth, and while the remarkable men who originated it were still a united band, this young clergyman, in the retirement of his parsonage in the beautiful lake district, clearly foreseeing the scope and issues of the movement, conceived the bold idea of meeting it by an exhibition of those principles involved in the aim and constitution of the Church of Christ and of the Church of England, to which, in its characteristic opinions, spirit and aims, it was directly opposed.

Even at that early period his keen insight into principles, and into the spirit and circumstances which condition their growth and development, enabled him to predict the expansion and partial ascendency of the Tractarian movement for a considerable time. "Doubtless," he writes, "the principles of the exclusive system will spread for a while; for they are a powerful appeal to the latent superstition of an unsettled age. They fall in with the reaction which has taken place in the religious minds of England since the last century. They are exactly such as are calculated to find enthusiastic reception with those who feel the need of something more than the unintelligent zeal, or the hollow orthodoxy, of the past and passing generations could supply, but who are yet ill taught in the true spirit of the gospel. They afford to the less educated laity considerable pretext for what the majority of mankind most like,—a formal and vicarious religion—an appearance of fixedness and infallibility to repose upon,—a shadow semblance of things not wished to be seen more clearly; and to the clergy, the exaltation of the clerical order which they permit and almost require, is a temptation too hard to be frequently resisted."

On all, or nearly all, the questions at issue in this controversy, the reader will find in this book much that is fresh and suggestive. The tendency of the writer's mind is to gravitate to the great principles that underlie all practical questions, and these he generally seizes with a firm grasp, and applies with remarkable candour and fearlessness. This habit of theoretic thoroughness is balanced, however, by a constant recognition of the complicated practical conditions which lawfully limit and modify the application of abstract principles to institutions and usages that have grown slowly, and become entwined with what is deepest in the heart and life of a people. Partly as a result of this philosophic habit of mind, but still more as the instinct of a chastened and catholic Christian spirit, this book is pervaded throughout by a candour and calmness and charity too rare among controversialists of all classes, but the more beautiful because they are so rare.

The weak point of the author's polemic against the Ritualists, as they are now popularly designated, is the "broad church" theory of the constitution of the Church of Christ on which he takes his stand. While stating and applying those principles of the New Testament Church which exclude sacerdotal pretensions, he is thoroughly effective; but in contending for freedom of development and organisation in all other respects, on the ground that New Testament practice was not uniform, and therefore not authoritative – although this might be necessary to cover the anomalies

which he frankly admits to exist in his own church—he gives an advantage to his adversaries which they know how to use. The book, however, does not profess to discuss fully and exhaustively any one of the great topics of which it treats; and not only its incomplete and fragmentary character, but the unsound principle to which we have just referred, by which it relieves the Church of after ages from the control of primitive precedent in its constitution and government, unfit it for use as a text-book or guide: but as a series of connected thoughts, generally just, often profound, and always bedewed with rare gentleness and charity, we recommend this book to all thoughtful students of the great controversy with which it deals. R. T.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Besides Messrs Blackie & Son's tiny but useful reprints for popular circulation of Bunyan's minor tractates, of which two are on our table, (one including *The Resurrection* and *The Barren Figtree*, the other, his posthumous work on *Justification* and his well-known treatise on the *Jerusalem Sinner Saved*), the Religious Tract Society have ventured on issuing, as one of their illustrated and ornamental volumes for this season, the autobiographical *Grace Abounding* of the great dreamer. They have taken liberties, however, with their original, which may be useful, but are of doubtful propriety. Part of the text is omitted,—what, or how much, it would have been as well to indicate; the "relation" of his arrest, trial, and imprisonment, first published after his death, from a MS. supposed to be Bunyan's own, is intercalated before the last section of the *Grace Abounding;* and to the whole is then appended the very meagre and thin *Continuation*, ascribed to Charles Doe. We have no doubt that the "Autobiography" thus made up, will be welcome to many, and the portions omitted from the text are probably omitted with judgment, and to the advantage of the volume for modern readers; but we rather dread an extensive application of this style of "adaptation" to our religious classics. No such misgiving withholds us from welcoming the same society's new edition of Foster's *Essays*. To the four which formed the original series, has here been added the essay which John Foster prefixed to his edition of Doddridge's *Rise and Progress;* a conjunction which appears to us not permissible only, but eminently suitable. Other publications of the Religious Tract Society, which we need only name, are *Lyrics of Ancient Palestine*, a collection of poetical pieces referring to successive events in Old Testament history, printed on thick paper, with illustrations (many of them from familiar designs), for the drawing-room table; and a new edition of Milner's handbook of astronomy, *The Heavens and the Earth*. Mr Samuel Smiles has told the story of *The Huguenots in France* (Strahan, 1873), with a fair amount of spirit, and abundance of genuine sympathy. The book is popular and slight; but these are days in which we cannot do too much to bring back into

the memory of the public, what the martyrs of the Reformed Church endured at the hands of Rome, and for what truths of the pure Gospel they endured it. The work is a worthy companion to the same writer's *Settlements, &c. of the Huguenots in England and Ireland.* He has appended (what is really a separate treatise) a lively and readable account of a visit paid to the Vaudois country in 1869, reprinted from *Good Words.* The Waldenses have also found in the Rev. J. N. Worsfold, M.A., whose *Vaudois of Piedmont* (London: Shaw & Co., 1873) is before us, a very sympathising and admiring visitor. But Mr Worsfold is too good an Episcopalian, not to find the Presbyterian polity of this interesting and primitive church an offence in his eyes. Therefore he adopts, on what appears to us most slender evidence, the theory that the Episcopate as it universally prevailed in the fourth century, was preserved among the Vaudois, down till the year 1630, when, having lost their pastors by pestilence, they obtained a supply from Geneva, whose influence changed the church's polity from Episcopal to Presbyterian. It was an unhappy necessity, therefore, "not a wilful departure from the traditions of her earlier history"! We shall leave our Waldensian friends to answer this reading of their history. Mr Worsfold, however, has in this little book, made an appeal to English Christians of his own community to help the active and enterprising church of the valleys, which we hope will be warmly responded to. Of quite another sort is a little book by Mr Thomas Cooper, well known as a lecturer on the Christian side against the crude infidelity current among working men. *God, the Soul, and a Future State* (Hodder & Stoughton), is rather a pretentious title, but the volume contains a couple of very popular and easy, but telling, lectures, on the old points,—the Being of God, and the Spiritual Nature of Man. Ministers troubled with the simmering of atheistic doubts in the minds of half-educated artizans and others, could hardly do them a better service than put this little book into their hands. Mr Cooper knows how to put his case, so as to convince his own class.

Of books illustrating special portions of holy writ, we have the fortieth volume of Messrs Clark's fourth series of the Foreign Theological Society, which contains the first part of Dr Keil's *Commentary on the Prophecies of Jeremiah.* There are perhaps fewer books on this prophet's writings than on any other in the canon, so that this volume and its coming successor will be very welcome to bible students. It has the same character of careful elaboration which we have mentioned in connection with previous works of the author. *The Song of Solomon,* from the French of Albert Réville, pastor of the Walloon Church, Rotterdam (Williams & Norgate), is an attempt similar to that of M. Rénan in his *Cantique des Cantiques,* to show the real basis of the song, and to divide it naturally into cantos. We could not decide, without careful comparison, which of them has succeeded best in the matter, but both of them render true service to the Book of God in contending for a natural interpretation first of all. That being settled, it is quite open to preachers to use this poem of pure and noble earthly love, as illustrating spiritual love. Hereby the book is wholly freed from the offence not unjustly taken, when spiritual relations are thought to be the primary motive of the

poet. Of *Apostolic Times and their Lessons; or, Plain, Practical Readings from the Acts of the Apostles*, by Rev. C. H. Ramsden, M.A. (Hatchards), the author says very truly, "I have not attempted anything critical." His chapters are filled with evangelical truth, if not with any novelty of illustration, or much force of expression. Different, indeed, is *The Church in the House, a series of Lessons on the Acts of the Apostles*, by William Arnot (Nisbet & Co.), which, like all that comes from this author's pen, is racy and readable, based upon solid study, and brightened with facts gathered by an unusually observant eye, and with the fancies of an active imagination. Having in our last number commended to our readers Messrs Clark's issue of Meyer's Commentaries, we need here only note the publication of that *On the Romans*, Vol. 1. *The Companions of the Lord; Chapters on the Lives of the Apostles*, by Charles E. B. Reid, M.A. (Religious Tract Society), is a book which deserves to rank among helpful aids to gospel study. The author has brought into as much completeness as possible, the scattered notices of the twelve with a research almost exhaustive, and with results as interesting as they are valuable. We did not notice on their publication the two volumes by the editor of this *Review*, on *The Beatitudes of the Kingdom* and *The Laws of the Kingdom;* but we think ourselves justified in calling attention to them now in connection with the publication of *The Relations of the Kingdom to the World* (Nisbet & Co.). The three volumes constitute a full commentary on the great "Sermon on the Mount."

Of books of popular instruction in Scripture truth, we note *Words spoken to my Friends*, by Rev. Gordon Calthrop, M.A. (W. Hunt & Co.), and *The Odd Five Minutes*, by Rev. F. Bourdillon, M.A. (Religious Tract Society). The former is a book of exceedingly good practical sermons, going directly home to heart and conscience, and well fitted to send the hearers away in a spirit of self-examination. The latter is a series of papers having the same end in view, and accomplishing it, although not formally founded on any text. These papers are suitable for reading at mothers' meetings and similar gatherings. In *The Divine Glory of Christ* (Religious Tract Society), the author, Rev. Charles J. Brown, D.D., of Edinburgh, has done a good work in setting forth the *indirect* evidence of Scripture to the divinity of Jesus. In a manner somewhat analogous to the argument of the *Horæ Paulinæ*, he shows that this great doctrine so pervades the Scriptures, that we cannot accept them and reject it. This is a small but a pregnant volume. The writer's own deep convictions are unmistakable, but he states them with such an absence of imperious dogmatism, and such an attractiveness of earnest love, that we should hope to find his book as useful in winning opponents, as it must be in warming the hearts of friends. *Light from Calvary in the Seven Last Words of Jesus*, by the Rev. R. H. Ireland (Nisbet & Co.), is the work of a spiritual and poetic soul glorying in the cross. *Sermons*, by the Rev. William Ramage of Glasgow (Edmonston & Douglas), belong to the calm, instructive style of preaching, and take therein a very high place. It may be that the careless multitude would not be stirred by them so much as they would be by

another kind of address, but there are diversities of gifts, and "God fulfils himself in many ways." Thoughtful Christians will love and enjoy this volume. In *The Healing Waters of Israel; or, The Story of Naaman the Syrian* (Nisbet & Co.), we have another specimen of that kind of book which the author, Dr J. R. Macduff, has a happy facility in writing. Round a selected story of the Bible he gathers illustrations which commend themselves to his polished taste, and elicits from the whole good spiritual lessons. People acquainted with former works of the Rev. Dr John Cumming, will know what to expect in his *From Patmos to Paradise* (Blackwood & Sons). We cannot advise others to take the trouble of judging of the author's attempts to synchronise John's apocalypse and the world's history, nor of reading the author's renewed scoldings of the Pope.

*Good Tidings of Great Joy to all People*, by Mr James Fraser of Brae, sometime prisoner in the Bass (Nisbet & Co.), and *The Best Match; or, The Soul's Espousal to Christ*, by the Rev. Edward Pearse, 1672 (Glasgow, D. Bryce), are reprints of good Puritan theology, which will feed souls that have already learned the first principles of the oracles of God.

The Rev. John Harrison, D.D., author of *Whose are the Fathers?* gives *An Answer to the Eucharistic Doctrine of Romanists and Ritualists.* (Longman.) The author's extensive study of the early Christian writers enables him to shew that the peculiar views of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper held by the priestly party, have not the support in antiquity for which they contend. This is important and satisfactory; and though of course we hold that there is no appeal but to Scripture on this question, still it is good service to take this boasted support also away from the sacramentalists. A sufficiently accurate acquaintance with Swedenborg's views may be had, without wandering through his voluminous works, by reading *Outlines of Swedenborg's Doctrines* (Longman).

The season of the year is prolific in volumes, which we can only find space to acknowledge. Such are Mr Wright's *Memoir of John Lovering Cooke*, formerly of the Royal Artillery, and Mrs Weitbrecht's abridged *Memoir of her Husband*, who was a highly esteemed agent of the Church Missionary Society in India. In her *Soldiers and Servants of Christ*, Miss Lehrer has rapidly culled from Church History notices of good men, designed to interest young readers. The plan is good; but the execution feeble and sketchy. Mr William Logan has gathered a number of "Notes and Recollections" about the first leaders, or, as he calls them, *The Early Heroes of the Temperance Reformation* (Glasgow Scottish Temperance League), which were worth preserving, especially now that the movement is passing into new shapes. By the way, he confirms the origin of the term *teetotal* from a stuttering orator's effort to advocate the "total" disuse of intoxicants. *Homes Made and Marred* is an anonymous book "for working men and their wives" (Religious Tract Society), in the form of a domestic tale of humble life. Mr Rae-Brown's *Dawn of Love* (Nisbet) is a poem or "idyll" with a religious moral. Miss Havergal's verses, collected under the title, *Ministry of Song* (Nisbet), have reached a fourth edition, and deserve it. M.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN
# EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

APRIL 1874.

## ART. I.—*Influence of Wicliffe upon Huss and the Bohemian Reformation.*

*Johann Von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation.* Von GOTTHARD LECHLER, Der Theologie Doctor und Ordentlichem Professor, Superintendenten in Leipzig. Leipzig. 1873.

*Documenta Mag. Johannis Hus Vitam, Doctrinam, Causam in Concilio Constantiensi actam, et Controversias de Religione in Bohemia, annis* 1403–1418 *motas, illustrantia.* Collecta et edita per FRANZ PALACKY. Pragæ. 1869.

*Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkrieges,* von JAHRE, 1419, an. Prag. 1872–73.

*Die Vorläufer des Hussitenthums in Böhmen.* Von FRANZ PALACKY. Prag. 1869. Neue ausgabe.

*Über die Beziehungen und das Verhältniss der Waldenser zu den ehemaligen Secten in Böhmen.* Von FRANZ PALACKY. Prag. 1869.

*Geschichte von Böhmen.* Von FRANZ PALACKY. Prag. 1836–1867.

IN 1873 two great historical works were completed and given to the world, which have added greatly to our knowledge of Wicliffe and the Wicliffites, and of Huss and the Hussites. We refer to the works of Professor Lechler of Leipzig, and Dr Francis Palacky of Prague.

The work of Lechler on Wicliffe—in two vols. 8vo, extending to 1400 pages—is spoken of by himself as the chief literary labour of his life. In the first volume, which has much more new matter than the second, he has a copious historical introduction, in which he traces all the chief lines of Reformation tendency on the Continent and in England down to Wicliffe's time, after which he presents us with the

biography of the great English Reformer, and with an exposition of his philosophical and theological teaching. The biography is a great improvement upon all preceding ones in regard to the distinctness and consistency of the life-portrait which it exhibits; and the doctrinal exposition is much the fullest, minutest, and most exact, that has ever been attempted. The explanation is, that the learned author has had advantages for the production of his work much superior to those enjoyed by any of Wicliffe's earlier biographers; and the chief of these was the access which he obtained, by the favour of the Austrian Government, to the Wicliffe MSS. preserved in the Imperial Library of Vienna. The Latin works of the Reformer—not the English ones—were those which contained the scientific exposition of his views both in philosophy and theology; and of these, of which there remain not fewer than ninety-six, there are only six which are found exclusively in the libraries of England and Ireland, and only twenty-seven which have been preserved in any of our home collections, *i.e.* less than one-third of the whole number, more than two-thirds being found in the continental collections alone. But of all these collections, both British and foreign, the Vienna MSS. are by far the most important both in number and value; and of these Lechler, for the first time, has been able to make leisurely use for the purpose of Wicliffe's history.

Dr Palacky's historical labours upon Huss and the Hussites have also engrossed a large part of his life. Having undertaken, as early as 1830, a thorough reconstruction of the history of Bohemia, founded upon extensive original researches in the public archives and libraries, not only of Bohemia itself, but of Austria, Bavaria, Hungary, Poland, and Italy, he has filled three volumes of the series with the history of Huss and the Hussite wars, exhibiting it throughout in the light of original documents, and constructing it in a style of literary execution which has obtained for him, though a Protestant of the school of the Bohemian Brethren, the praise of equal impartiality and ability at the hands even of Roman Catholic critics. But Palacky has not been content with producing a new history of what he justly considers the proudest period of the Bohemian annals. He has occupied himself for several years back in preparing for publication a critical edition of all the most valuable original papers upon which his history of

the period is founded. In 1869 appeared a complete collection of such documents, in relation to the life, doctrine, and martyrdom of Huss, including all his letters, and all his answers to the accusations laid against him by his enemies—a volume which has been pronounced by Lechler a model of its kind. Last of all, in 1873, he brought out the second and concluding volume of his "Documentary Contributions to the History of the Hussite War, from 1419 to 1439." His smaller collateral pieces on the subject are also of much value, particularly his two tracts on "The Precursors of Hussitism in Bohemia," and on "The Relations of the Waldenses to the Hussite Sects," *i.e.* to the Taborites and the Unitas Fratrum, or United Bohemian Brethren.

With all these valuable historical contributions of German and Bohemian learning laid to our hands, it should not be difficult for us to indicate distinctly, however briefly, what was the nature and extent of the influence of Wicliffe upon Huss and the Bohemian Reformation of the fifteenth century.

Let us first of all inquire how it came to pass that so remote a country as Bohemia, and not rather France or the Netherlands or Germany, should have been the first to feel that influence. How was it, that while Frenchmen, in the persons of Gerson and D'Ailly, became in the Council of Constance the most formidable antagonists of Wicliffism, and while the German professors and students of the University of Prague were almost unanimous in resisting its first entrance into that school, the Bohemian professors and students should have become its earliest disciples and propagators? The answer to the question is easy, and need not detain us long.

Though Bohemia was remote from England, there was, even at that early date—during the last two decades of the fourteenth century, a considerable amount of intercourse between them, arising, in part, out of the celebrity of the universities of the two countries, which attracted on both sides numerous students, and partly out of the political connection which was established between the two kingdoms by the marriage of the young English king, Richard II., to the Princess Anna of Luxembourg, sister to King Wenceslaus IV. of Bohemia. The marriage took place in 1382, two years before the death of Wicliffe; and from that time we read not only of Bohemian

students, but also of nobles and statesmen undertaking journeys to England; and there was one distinguished visitor in particular, who combined both these characters of nobleman and student in his own person—Hieronymus, or Jerome of Prague —the ardent admirer of Wicliffe, the devoted friend and supporter of Huss in all the conflicts which he had himself so large a share in drawing on, and, at length, the sharer of his martyrdom at the hand of the same cruel tribunal.

But, of course, no mere opportunities or occasions of intercourse between the two countries could be sufficient to account for the early acceptance of Wicliffe's doctrines on the part of the Bohemian people. There must have been some previous preparation for this in the minds of the people themselves. There must have been some movement in the national mind antecedent to the beginning of the fifteenth century, bearing a certain resemblance to that which had prepared the English people so largely to embrace the teaching of Wicliffe. And so it was, in point of ascertained fact, although it is only in recent years that this has come to be fully known and understood. It was Palacky who first placed this subject in a clear and satisfactory light in his historical tract, entitled "The Precursors of Hussitism in Bohemia," which was first drawn up in the Czech language in 1842, and afterwards published in German without the author's name, in consequence of its publication in Prague being disallowed by the Austrian censorship. These "Precursors" were Conrad of Waldhausen, Miliç of Kremsier, Matthias of Janow, and Jan, or John, of Stekno,—all of them priests of intense moral earnestness, deeply moved by the flagrant corruptions of the Church, and who all laboured devotedly, either by voice or pen, or both, to promote a reformation both of clergy and people. Conrad, Miliç, Janow, and Stekno succeeded each other in the chief pulpits of Prague during the latter half of the fourteenth century. They were preachers sent in the spirit and power of Elias to prepare the way of the Lord among the Bohemian people. But they were rather moral reformers than evangelical heralds. They did the office for Bohemia of the Baptist rather than of the Apostles. In their day the kingdom of God was "at hand" to the Bohemians, but it was not yet "full come." It was in their school, however, that young Huss received his earliest lessons of religious

earnestness, and he was, no doubt, familiar with the remarkable writings of Matthias of Janow, who, though not so popular as the others in the pulpit, was more of a thinker and a theologian than any of the number. Neander, indeed, was of opinion that the germs of all the subsequent teaching of Huss were already to be found in his writings, and might even have been developed into that teaching, independently of the foreign impulse of Wicliffe. That is a speculation; but the fact is certain, that at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when Matthias of Janow's name had been almost forgotten, and some of his writings were accidentally discovered, there was found in them so much resemblance in spirit and principle to those of Huss, that they were included in the earliest collected editions of Huss' own works. And this was the more remarkable, that though a contemporary of Wicliffe, and of cognate spirit to his in many respects, no trace is to be found in all his extant writings of the influence of the English reformer. This is the verdict of Palacky himself. Large extracts from Janow are given in the last volume of Neander's History, published after his death. The deeply sympathetic study of this "reformer before the Reformation" was one of the latest employments of that beloved man of God.

Proceeding now to our main topic, How, we ask, are we to conceive of and estimate the influence of Wicliffe on John Huss and the Hussites? Was it an influence which first took effect upon Huss, and then, through him, upon his countrymen? Perhaps it is in this way that we usually conceive of it—that first Huss himself became Wicliffe's disciple, at a time when he stood alone in that respect, and that he was the one great duct of conveyance by which the Wicliffe spirit and principles were introduced into the mind of his nation. But such a mode of conception is entirely mistaken, and inconsistent with historical facts which are beyond dispute. The earliest seat of Wicliffism in Bohemia was the university of Prague; and among its teachers and students, as early as the year 1390,—only six years after Wicliffe's death,—the philosophical treatises of the English Reformer were already in hand. "Egoque et membra nostrae universitatis habemus et legimus illos libros ab annis viginti et pluribus," are words used by Huss in 1411. These "libri in artibus," as he acknowledged

to the Council of Constance in 1415, "sibi valde bene placebant;" but he speaks of other members of the university as being on the same footing as himself in this respect. He was then an undergraduate,—he did not take his bachelor's degree in arts till 1393; and in conceiving this early liking to Wicliffe's philosophical realism, he was much more likely to be influenced by his teachers, than to influence them or his fellow-students. It was not till 1400 or 1402 that he became acquainted with any of Wicliffe's theological works. But as there was a vital connection between the Reformer's philosophy and theology on many points, all who had imbibed an admiration for him as a metaphysician and logician, would naturally be predisposed to think favourably of his views as a divine; and there is no reason to suppose that Huss had more of this predisposition than any of his fellow-graduates. Indeed, it is known that some other members of the theological faculty were at first better disposed to receive Wicliffe's theological doctrines than he was himself—he left his old moorings more slowly, and went over to the new views of the foreign doctor more cautiously. This we shall have in evidence before us immediately in another connection. But it is plain enough already that Huss had never stood alone in his love for either the philosophy or the theology of Wicliffe. He was from the first only one of several disciples—apparently a goodly number. All along he found himself surrounded by many of his countrymen, who had passed through the same preparatory training and fallen under the same foreign influence as himself; and it was really this meeting of many on common ground with himself, to begin with, which opened for him a wide door of influence over his countrymen, and contributed to make that influence both rapid and decisive in its effects.

Passing from this point, we have next to consider the amount or extent of Wicliffe's influence upon Huss and the Hussite movement. This influence may be studied upon two sides: the extent to which it became a historical factor or power in originating the incidents and scenes of the movement—its beginnings, progress, and issues; its successes, conflicts, and catastrophes—and the extent to which Wicliffism, as a system of doctrines and Church-principles, passed into the convictions and doctrinal confessions, first of Huss himself, and then of the Hussites.

With regard to the former of these two questions there is, and there can be, no difference of opinion. However Neander and some other writers may speculate upon the question, whether Huss, independently of Wicliffe's writings, might not have become the author of a Bohemian Reformation—a speculation which is really idle and of no historical use,—the fact that Wicliffe's influence became a very powerful factor in the case is acknowledged by all parties. It would be irrelevant, therefore, to offer any historical proofs of the fact, or to raise any discussion upon it. But a fact which does not need to be proved may be usefully exemplified; and vivid or picturesque illustrations of the factors of history may still be interesting, where there is no use in producing them as verifications or arguments. In offering to the reader a short series of such illustrations, we start from the beginning of the whole movement, at the date when it first became an affair of public interest and notoriety. It began in the year 1403, in the university of Prague, and it took shape in the form of a public condemnation by the university of forty-five articles extracted from Wicliffe's writings; twenty-four of which were the same which had been condemned in 1382 by the Provincial Council of London, with twenty-one articles in addition, which had been extracted by John Hübner, a German Master of Arts, out of some of Wicliffe's theological works recently introduced from England into the university. It was undoubtedly Jerome of Prague who had imported these books into the country. He had visited Oxford in 1399 or 1400. He had found the memory of Wicliffe still cherished there by many learned and good men with high appreciation; he had obtained copies of some of his principal pieces,—the "Dialogus," the "Trialogus," and the "De Eucharistia,"—and already this zealous and able propagandist had been so successful in spreading Wicliffe's doctrines in the university, that the clergy of the cathedral had taken alarm, and had called upon the theological faculty to give judgment upon them. There was a great assembly of the faculty—doctors, masters, and bachelors—held on the 28th day of May 1403, and the forty-five articles were submitted. Immediately the progress which Wicliffism had already made in Prague was revealed. Stanislaus von Znyam, a doctor of theology, and an influential professor, boldly stood forward to

defend some of the articles, and did so in so plain-spoken a style that several of the older doctors took offence and withdrew from the hall. Huss, who had been a student under Stanislaus, did not go so far as his teacher, but warmly accused Hübner of having falsified the teaching of Wicliffe in the twenty-one articles formulated by him, and revealed the ardour of his attachment to Wicliffe's memory and teaching by declaring that such falsifiers of books deserved to die by fire more than two men who had shortly before suffered that extreme punishment in Prague for the adulteration of saffron. Of course the Wicliffites were still in a small minority. Judgment of condemnation was pronounced upon the articles, and the teaching of them in the university was prohibited. Such was the first incident of the Hussite drama, and such the first public appearance of Huss himself on its stage. It was a condemnation of Wicliffe, not of Huss; and Huss' appearance in it was as an ardent demander of justice to Wicliffe.

We recall next an exciting scene which was enacted in Prague on the 16th July 1410. It is the solemn, official burning of 200 volumes of Wicliffe's writings, in the quadrangle of the Archbishop's palace. In the preceding year, Archbishop Sbynjek, or Sbynko had sent messengers to Pope Alexander V., to represent to him that not only in Prague but in the whole of Bohemia and Moravia the errors of Wicliffe had spread and were still spreading; that it was high time to arrest the mischief; and that an indispensable measure for this end was to prohibit by papal authority all preaching outside of the cathedrals and the parish and convent churches,—this suggestion being chiefly aimed at the pulpit of Huss in the Bethlehem Chapel of Prague, where he had now for several years been preaching with great power and effect in the Bohemian tongue to thousands of all ranks in the capital. The Pope complied with the suggestion, and a Bull was issued on the 20th of December, authorising and instructing Sbynjek to call to his aid a council of four doctors of theology and two doctors of canon law, and to take instant measures for the suppression of the heresy both by compelling its favourers to abjure Wicliffite doctrine, and deliver up their copies of Wicliffe's books, and by the prohibition of all preaching, save in churches which were entitled to it by ancient usage. The Bull was

published in Prague on the 9th March 1410, and the Archbishop took immediate steps to carry out its behests. The six doctors were called to the prelate's counsels, and, under pain of excommunication, all books of Wicliffe's were ordered to be delivered into the Archbishop's possession for examination within an appointed time. Huss himself was the first to obey the order. Others followed his example, and more than 200 volumes were delivered in of all kinds, philosophical as well as theological. The doctors found it easy, within a very short time, to pronounce them all full of manifest errors and heresies; their judgment was confirmed as easily by a provincial council, which assembled on the 16th of June; and the books were solemnly condemned to be cast into the flames. It was in vain that the university protested against the measure — pointing out that it was impossible that any adequate examination of the books could have been made in so short a time. It was in vain that Huss, with some other friends, drew up a solemn protest and appeal to the new Pope, John XXIII., in the Bethlehem Chapel, not only in their own name, but in that of many other members of the university and nobles and citizens of Prague, in which they characterised it as a senseless proceeding to burn books of logic, mathematics, natural science, and philosophy, which had nothing to do with articles of religion. Had not the Apostle Paul, and the Church in all ages, studied the writings of heathens and heretics, in order either to utilise or to confute them? It was even in vain that the King himself interposed to prevent the carrying out of the Archbishop's edict. All he could effect was the delay of a few days, and on the 16th July the Archbishop proceeded to the last act. All the books were brought into the courtyard of his palace on the Hradschin, or castle-hill of Prague. The gates were closed, and a guard of soldiers drawn round the palace. All the clergy of the cathedral, and a multitude of priests from the parish churches, surrounded the pile of proscribed MSS., containing many written on costly parchment and in handsome bindings. All the bells of the city churches were set a-ringing in triumphant chorus; the torch was applied to the pile; and amid the accompaniment of a loud *Te Deum* sung by the whole assembly, the literary heap blazed up and was reduced to ashes. Two days after, the Archbishop pronounced the bann

upon Huss and all the friends who had joined with him in the Bethlehem Chapel protest, and this excommunication was ordered to be published in all the churches of the diocese.

"The Archbishop believed," says Lechler, "that he had put down the whole opposition, and intimidated public opinion. He thought he was already at the end; but he stood only at the beginning, for the measures which he had taken had no other effect than to excite and rouse the party who sided with Huss. The two parties began to oppose each other with much more violence than before, and the excitement spread even to the lowest strata of the population. The Archbishop was defied and scorned; satirical songs were sung about him in the public streets, as an A B C scholar who could burn books, but not read them, and the students of the university cried out openly against him, 'He has burnt Wicliffe's books. Yes! but we have plenty more left, and every day we are making new copies. Let him command us a second time to deliver them up, and he shall see whether we shall obey him.[1] Aye! and he shall yet have to pay us for the books which he has burned!'"

---

[1] It is curious that the boastings of the Prague students about their Wicliffe manuscripts should be borne out by so palpable a verification as the existence at the present day of so many such MSS. in the libraries of Vienna and of Prague itself. Some of these very MSS. may have been, or rather undoubtedly were, among the books which were then rescued from the flames; and not improbably many of the rest owed their transcription to the very event to which we have just referred. Last July we saw and examined in the Vienna collection several volumes which were undoubtedly written some years before 1410; one of them (No. 1338) bears the remarkable date 1384, the year of Wicliffe's death, and must have been copied by some Bohemian student then in England, for the style of the writing and illumination is distinctly Bohemian; and there are five other volumes of the same series all written in the same elegant style and on the same material, which once belonged to the same proprietor, the Dean of Lymburg, in Bohemia. No. 1294 is another very remarkable instance of the same kind. It is a copy of one of Wicliffe's most valuable works, never yet printed—"De Veritate Sacræ Scripturæ"—and at the end of it is found the interesting note, that it was carefully corrected at Oxford, in the year 1407, on the vigil of the purification of the Virgin, by Nicolaus Faulfisch and George Knyehnicz, who also added an alphabetical index. This Nicolaus is thought to have been a relative of Jerome of Prague, whose example he had followed in visiting the great theological school of England. In the same volume are included the "Tractatus de Ecclesia," and the "Liber de Dominio," all three being written in the same hand. Here, then, are unquestionable examples of volumes which escaped the fiery fate of the 200 martyred MSS. It is no doubt owing to the war which was so long waged against the works of Wicliffe and their admirers, that the name of Wicliffe himself seldom or never occurs in these Bohemian transcripts. They exhibit short titles of the several tracts, but nothing more; it is only by internal evidence, or by information obtained from other sources, that their Wicliffe authorship is known. And before closing these references to the Vienna MSS., we ought to take notice both of the large number, and of the great importance of the works which they

Worse followed. On the 22d of July—the Feast of Mary Magdalene—when the Archbishop was celebrating high mass, a tumult broke out among the congregation, which frightened him out of the church and nearly forty priests with him.

contain. The first volume of the new catalogue of the MSS. of the Imperial Library contains 90 entries under the name of Wicliffe, and the third volume 120 entries. Of course, as the number of his Latin works does not exceed ninety-five, a large proportion of these entries are transcripts of the same works, and this of course serves to verify so far what has been said of the interest and demand which the new works from England had excited in the educated mind of Bohemia. There are several instances in the catalogue of five, six, or seven copies occurring of the same piece. The "Trialogus" has five copies, the "Dialogus" six, the "De Septem Donis Spiritus Sancti," the "De Quatuor Interpretationibus," and the "De Eucharistia," each six, and the "De Simonia" seven copies. Indeed, but for this Vienna collection of nearly forty volumes, several of the most important writings of the productive author would have been irreparably lost—several of the treatises, *e.g.* included in what came to be called the "Summa Theologiæ," in twelve books. Of these twelve books, copies of the third, fourth, fifth, seventh, and eighth—nearly the half of the whole—are to be found in the Vienna collection alone, and of the ninth book, only in the library of Prague; so that there are only six out of the whole twelve of which copies exist in the libraries of England or Ireland, or in any other. Of the "Trialogus," and its supplement, "De Dotatione Ecclesiæ," the only four copies known to exist are all in Vienna, and were not long ago used by Lechler to prepare a new edition of this best known treatise of Wicliffe for the Clarendon Press. Some other treatises of the author are preserved only in the libraries of Prague. The Prague collections in the University and Capitular Libraries may well have existed there since the days of Huss. The Vienna collection is believed to have been formed out of MSS. obtained from the Jesuit houses and colleges of Bohemia, when these were suppressed by the Emperor Joseph II. towards the end of last century. The Jesuits had themselves come into possession of them in the seventeenth century, after the forcible restoration of the Catholic Church in Bohemia, and the suppression of Protestantism. The Wicliffe MSS. now existing in Stockholm were carried off thither by the Swedes, during the same tragical period of the Thirty Years' War. More than once the stout soldiers of Gustavus Adolphus were masters of the land of Huss and the Hussites, and by means, fair or unfair, they made themselves possessors of some of these valuable relics of the Hussite period. In this way these Wicliffe MSS. have had a history marked by almost as many vicissitudes as the kingdom of Bohemia itself. It is wonderful that they should have come scatheless through so many revolutions. Surely the printing and publication of some at least of these literary monuments of English genius and learning and piety, must be an event awaiting them in the not distant future. Undoubtedly England owes this debt both of justice and gratitude to the greatest of all her Reformers. It is much to be desired and hoped that the University of Oxford, which has recently given us a valuable collection of Wickliffe's English sermons and tracts, and also a new and much improved edition of the "Trialogus," edited by Professor Lechler, will not stop till she has issued from the Clarendon Press editions of others of his most important Latin works in the same excellent style.

Worse still! On the same day, in St Stephen's Church in the Neustadt of Prague, a priest, when reading from the pulpit the excommunication against Huss and his followers, was set upon by six men with drawn swords, and almost killed. Incidents of this description alarmed the clergy to such a degree that they did not dare any longer to publish the excommunication.

Our next illustration takes the shape of a remarkable correspondence which took place between Huss and an English Wicliffite before the close of the same year, 1410.

The Englishman dates his letter from London, 8th September 1410. It is written in a strain of beautiful, evangelical piety, rich in Scriptural doctrine, and couched in a good Latin style. We only present a few sentences of it, that we may be able to give Huss' most interesting reply:

"Dulcissimi in Domino, whom I love in the truth, and not I only, but all who have acknowledged the truth, which abideth in you and shall be with you, by God's grace, for ever. I rejoiced greatly at the coming of most beloved brethren [these must have been Bohemian Wycliffites], who bore testimony to the truth that is in you, 'even as also ye walk in the truth.' I have heard, brethren, how sharply Antichrist troubles you, by bringing upon the faithful people of Christ manifold temptations; and truly it is nothing strange. . . . . Well, then, Brother Huss, best beloved in Christ (although unknown to me in face, yet not in faith and love, because it is not in the power of earthly distance to disjoin those who are efficaciously bound to each other in the love of Christ), be strong in the grace which has been given to thee; labour as a good soldier of Jesus Christ; preach the word; be instant by word and by example, and bring back as many as you can to the way of truth. For the truth of the Gospel is not to be kept back on account of the frivolous censures and fulminations of Antichrist. And, therefore, I pray you to strengthen and confirm to the utmost of your power the members of Christ made weak by the devil; and if so it please the Most High God, Antichrist shall shortly be brought to nought. And there is one thing which fills me with joy to hear, that in your kingdom and elsewhere, God has stirred up the hearts of His faithful to such a degree, that even unto prisons, banishment, and death, they rejoice to suffer for the word of Christ. . . . .

"Written in London, on the nativity of the glorious Virgin, A.D. 1410. Your servant, desiring to become your companion in labour, Ricardus Wychewitze, the meanest of priests."[1]

Huss' reply to his correspondent is a document of great historical value, not only from the interesting light which it

[1] Lechler conjectures with a high degree of probability, that this Richard Wychewitze was the same person who is referred to in Wilkin's "Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ," vol. iii. p. 394, as a Lollard preacher, who was brought

throws upon his own spirit and character, but also on account of the photographic truth with which it fixes the circumstances and situation of the time at which it was penned, written as it was from Prague, at the focus of the movement of which Huss was the very soul and mainspring:

"*To Magister Richard, the Englishman.*

"DEAR BROTHER—Your letter, a gift from above, from the Father of lights, has kindled a vehement flame in the minds of the brethren in Christ here. So much sweetness, efficacy, strong consolation, does it contain, that if all other writings were swept away by Antichrist as

---

before a convocation of the clergy in 1419 upon a charge of heresy, and who after suffering repeated and long imprisonment, was at length burnt at the stake on Tower Hill in 1431. His English name was Wyche; the *witze* added to it in the "Historia et Monumenta Joannis Hussi," being, as Lechler suggests, no more than the usual *Czechian* patronymic formation, by the addition of which the foreign name had become naturalised in Bohemia. If this conjecture be accepted, and it seems a well-founded one, Huss' correspondent had a very remarkable posthumous destiny. He was for many years venerated, as a saint, by annual pilgrimages made from all the surrounding counties to the place of his martyrdom on Tower Hill, which could only be put a stop to by the authority of a royal proclamation. The proclamation will be found in Fox's "Acts and Monuments," vol. iii. p. 703, under date 1440, in the reign of Henry VI. It describes the Lollard martyr, thus curiously canonised by the people, as "Richard Wiche, late clerk, who heretofore long since heretically did hold, teach, and publicly preach certain heresies and erroneous opinions in many places within our realm of England." Whether "Richard the Englishman" ever joined the Bohemian Wycliffites, as he seems in the end of his letter to Huss to indicate a wish to do, we do not know. But it is not at all improbable that he did so, for it was no unusual thing for the English Lollards to go over to Bohemia at that most interesting time. We read of two young Englishmen, probably students, being in Prague at the very beginning of the troubles, who had a satirical picture displayed on the walls of their apartment, exhibiting in caricature the antithesis between Christ and Antichrist in regard to their outward estates and conditions of life, which many of the embryo-Hussites of the city flocked to see. And there was another English Wicliffite, Peter Payne, an Oxford-man, Vice-Principal of St Edmund Hall, who went over to Bohemia about the time of Huss' martyrdom, and was admitted *ad eundem* by the university there, who very soon became a prominent man among the Hussites and seems to have lived all the rest of his days among them. His career has never, so far as we know, been investigated by any English historian, though he is referred to both by Leland and Bale in their lists of English writers; but from the frequent glimpses one gets of him in the pages of Lechler and Palacky, his history, if put together, could not fail to be very curious and interesting. Professor Shirley makes a scornful allusion to him as an adventurer, but he was surely something better than this, or he could never have taken so high a place as he did among the divines and leaders of a Church which was the Church of a nation and suffered from no lack of men of eminent talent and learning.

with a flood, this letter alone would suffice for their souls' health ; and, therefore, revolving in my mind the marrow and vigour of its contents, I took it with me into the pulpit, and before reading it to a congregation of, I should think, nearly ten thousand men, I exclaimed, 'See here, beloved brethren, how great a care of your salvation is felt by the most faithful preachers of Christ in foreign lands, how they desire to pour out their whole heart to us, if so they might help to keep us in the law of the Lord.' After reading the letter, I added these words, 'See how this dear brother our Richard, who was once a companion in Gospel labours of Magister John Wycliff, has written to us a letter so full of force and comfort that if I had no other writing to make use of, it would be my duty to expound it for Christ's Gospel as long as I live ; and so will I do by the help of Jesus Christ our Lord.' And so much were the faithful in Christ kindled by it, that they begged me to publish a translation of it in the tongue of our own nation.

"But what I am to write to you and other dear brethren with you, I know not. You and they are too learned for me to instruct you ; and can he who is the weaker say anything to strengthen those who are stronger than himself? And what can I say in the way of information? You are already aware of all that I could tell you. It only remains to me to entreat and entreat again the help of your prayers, and to express my thanks that from blessed England Bohemia has already received so great benefits by your care and pains, under the providence of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor is it strange that to some these blessings should be a savour of death unto death. But joy it is that to many they are a savour of life unto life everlasting ; for to such an extent has the enemy of man scattered tares in our kingdom, that it was seldom that a single grain of wheat could be seen anywhere ; the whole field was so covered with the nettles of men, that the way of salvation could with difficulty be found. But now the people who walked in darkness have seen the great light of Jesus Christ, which, by the blessing of our Saviour, the people receive with the utmost ardour—barons, knights, counts, and commonalty—which, if your holy fellowship in England could see and know, their hearts would leap for joy, and they would break forth with those words of the prophet, 'Rejoice, O barren, thou that didst not bear ; break forth and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child, for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord.' Know, dearest brother, that the people here wish to hear nothing but Holy Scripture, especially the Gospels and the Epistles ; and everywhere, in city or town, in village or castle, as soon as a preacher of the holy Word appears, the people flock in crowds to hear him, despising their disordered clergy ; and therefore it is that Satan has risen up against us, because already the tail of Behemoth has been wounded, and all that remains is that the Lord Jesus Christ should next bruise his head. See ! I have only gently touched his tail, and he has opened his mouth to swallow me up, and all my brethren together. He rages now, and with lying words at one time cries, Heretics ! at another talks blandly,—now spreading the flame of censure and flaring the torch of

his horrid fulminations in all the surrounding dioceses, while here, in Prague, he does not dare to touch a hair of my head. For his hour is not yet come, because not yet has the Lord delivered from his mouth, by means of myself and my brethren, those whom He hath before chosen to the life of glory; and on this account He will give boldness to the preachers of the Gospel, that they may continue to trouble, at least, the tail of Behemoth, until his head and all his members be utterly destroyed. That is what we long for from the soul; that is what we labour for. For that, as you wish, dear brother, we are bound humbly to sustain death itself; nor ought we, by the help of our Almighty Lord, ever to fail, faint, or sink. Our most loving Master promises, 'I will be with him in tribulation; I will deliver him, and glorify him.' O most holy deliverance! O glorification! be thou in store for Richard and his brethren, who have already endured so many sore tribulations! Help also miserable me, that, along with my brethren, I may boldly confess Thy law in the midst of a wicked and adulterous generation. Give us, oh give us help from trouble, O Lord, for vain is the help of men! Let our help be in Thee! To Thee let us be drawn by that threefold cord which cannot be broken, because Jesus Christ, the Lord, Himself has twisted it. And to you and your helpers, most beloved brother, may the Lord vouchsafe a safe and honoured life, that you may yet live for many years, and lead back wandering sheep into the way of truth.

"The Church of Christ in Bohemia salutes the Church of Christ in England, desiring to join with her in the confession of the holy faith, in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. The God of glory be your reward, that with so great labours you have supplied us with copies (*exempla*) in our need. The peace be yours which passeth all understanding. Amen."

Here, then, we have, as long ago as 1410, the Church of Christ in Bohemia saluting and thanking the Church of Christ in "Anglia benedicta," and thanking her for the copies of the writings of the great evangelical English Doctor which she had received in her spiritual necessity through the hands of laborious Lollard transcribers; for that would appear to have been the occasion of this most interesting correspondence. It is the only written correspondence between the Wicliffism of England and the Wycliffism of Bohemia which, so far as we know, has come down to us; and we see how perfectly the two were joined together in the same mind and in the same spirit. It is, indeed, impossible to say on which side of the correspondence the tone of evangelical godliness was the deeper or the more apostolic. We see on both sides the revival of a Christian life worthy of the best ages, of the very birth-age, of the Church.[1]

[1] Huss' letter is printed in Palacky's "Documenta," and Richard the Englishman's in the "Historia et Monumenta" of Huss. Nürnberg, 1715.

We pass now from 1410 to 1415,—from Prague at the beginning of the open struggle between the light and the darkness, to Constance, on the eve of the final catastrophe or the final victory, as it may be equally well called, according as we look at it with the eye of sense or with the eye of faith. It was a very short interval, only five years; and yet these five brief years of struggle and testimony to the truth under persecution and martyrdom, proved sufficient to pull down the fabric of Roman despotism over a whole kingdom, to convert almost a whole nation of Papists into a nation of Hussites, and to make them glory in calling themselves by the name of one of Rome's execrated and immolated heretics, more than they had ever venerated any of her thousand canonised saints.

When the Council was resolved upon by Pope John XXIII., at the earnest instance of Sigismund, King of Hungary, in October 1413, it was not imagined or expected by any one that the movement in Bohemia would form any part of its business. But in the interval of a year before its assembling in November 1414, the rising heresy of Huss had awakened so widespread a horror over the whole western church, that it was deemed imperatively necessary to take up the subject at the coming council. And how was Hussism regarded at the Council from first to last? Simply as the heresy of Wicliffe propagated from England to Bohemia. That hated heresy had been solemnly condemned in London by the Anglican bishops and doctors in the provincial council of 1382, but at that time was regarded in Rome as no more than an English affair which needed only to be vigorously dealt with on the spot to give no further trouble. But the case was much altered now; the affair was become one which concerned the whole church of the west; and it could not be passed over by a General Council which was to assemble to cure every evil which affected the whole church-body, "both in head and members."

Huss arrived in Constance on the 3d of November 1414, and on the 28th of that month he was, with scandalous perfidy, in spite of the king's safe conduct, and before he had even had a single hearing, detained a prisoner in the palace of the Bishop of Constance, where the Pope was lodged. The Council was now sure of its victim; Wicliffe's successor was in their grasp, and they had only to begin by renewing their condemnation of the dead Wicliffe, and then, with the

inexorable logic of persecuting consistency, to end by condemning and executing his living disciple.

On the 6th day of April 1415, in the fifth plenary sitting of the council, they appointed the same commissioners to examine and report upon the doctrines of Wicliffe who had been previously appointed to do the same work with the doctrines of Huss,—a plain intimation that they regarded the two causes as one. On the 4th of May, at the sixth plenary sitting, judgment was pronounced upon Wicliffe, to the effect that in that age John Wicliffe, *pseudo-Christianus*, was *dux et princeps*, leader and chief in the warfare against Christianity and the holy church. His articles, forty-five in number—the same which were condemned at Prague—were condemned afresh; all his books and tractates adjudged to be burned by the public executioner; his name and memory declared to be infamous for ever; and his very bones ordained to be dug up from the grave at Lutterworth where they had lain for thirty years, and cast forth from all holy ground.

It was thus the council raged revengefully against the dead Reformer. It was a too sure indication of how they meant to proceed against the living one who was now in their power. If they could have fastened upon him the condemned heresy of Wicliffe on the subject of transubstantiation, that would have been the shortest and easiest road by which to take him to the stake. And they tried hard to do it at his second public hearing in the refectorium of the Franciscan Convent, on the 7th of June. But they were surprised to find that he persistently denied that he had ever held or taught the doctrine of Wicliffe upon that article, and they were under the necessity at last of allowing that most damning of all accusations to drop out of the process. There was only one heresy which in their eyes could come second to it in enormity, —the heresy of thinking and speaking too freely of the office and power of the Pope. Among other passages quoted against Huss from his later and latest works, was one in which he had dared to say that the church in the days of the apostles had done excellently well without the Papacy, and possibly it could do so still, and even to the world's end. It was spoken more in Wicliffe's trenchant style than was usual with Huss, and there was one fanatical English papist present whom this did

not escape. John Stokes, a doctor of Cambridge, struck in with the bitter and death-dealing observation, "Huss in this point is out-and-out a follower of Wicliffe. He has no need to talk boastfully of *his* writings and doctrines. His doctrines are Wicliffe's more than his own."

This last incident completes our historical illustrations of the influence of Wicliffe on Huss and the Hussite history. It is a very vivid and picturesque one—an English Papist, who had doubtless had many a tussle with the Wicliffites in England, standing face to face over against the chief Wicliffite of Bohemia, and identifying him unmistakeably as a true disciple of the great heresiarch of the age. Nor was it the first time that Stokes had met Huss. He had been in Prague a few years before, and though a passing stranger had meddled offensively in the university dispute about the heresy of Wicliffe's teaching. Huss had challenged him then to a public disputation upon the subject, and Stokes had declined it on the score of his having necessary business elsewhere, but he professed his readiness to meet his challenger on other ground —in Paris, or some other competent palæstra of learned disputation. They never met in Paris, but they met in Constance, and Stokes had his bitter revenge upon his former challenger by helping to bring him to the stake, and by throwing an English faggot into the flaming pile.

The two great figures, then, of the English doctor and the Bohemian magister, everywhere in this history of Huss and the Hussites, are seen standing side by side, shoulder to shoulder, hand in hand—in the University of Prague, in the pulpit of the Bethlehem Chapel, and on the floor of the great Council of Constance. Let us, before we leave the closing scene, see how Lechler compares the two in point of their personal endowments, intellectual and moral.

"Huss is not an original, creative genius like Wicliffe, and as a thinker has no talent either for speculation or for system. On the field of theological thinking Wicliffe is a *kingly* spirit. His thought-power is inborn, and by dint of unwearied mental labour, he has gained the position of a leader of thought. Huss appears like a star of the second magnitude, and revolves like a planet round Wicliffe as his sun, while both wheel round the central Sun, which is Christ Himself. Moreover, Huss is not a *character* like Wicliffe—twice-hardened, and sharp like steel; a

nature strong within, moving right on without looking either to the right or left, following only his convictions, and carrying them out logically and energetically to their extremest consequences, sometimes, it may be, with a degree of harshness which wounds and gives offence. Compared with Wicliffe, Huss is rather a soft nature—a soul tenderly strung—rather formed to be passive and receptive, than called to energetic action at his own instance, or to heroic aggression and conquest. But it is not meant by this that he had a feeble nature—a characterless, compliant personality. With softness and fineness of soul, may quite well be combined a moral tenacity, an unvarying faithfulness, an unbending constancy — a character which, by reason of this very combination becomes attractive and winning, and draws to itself the most unmixed esteem and veneration. Add to this the moral purity and unselfishness of the man, who practised an almost ascetic severity upon himself, his heartfelt godliness and tender conscientiousness, which led him on all occasions to seek not himself or his own glory, but before all things the glory of God and his Saviour, and along with this, the honour of his fatherland, and the untarnished reputation of his nation for orthodox piety. In sincere zeal for God's honour and the cause of Jesus Christ, both men—Wicliffe and Huss—were alike; only this zeal in Wicliffe was of a more fiery, masculine, energetic character. In Huss it was a warmth more quietly glowing, of almost feminine delicacy, of inmost truth and endurance. And this *heart* of the man,—unshaken with all its softness unto death in its most dreadful form—this unconquerable, yea, all-conquering endurance of the man in the confession of gospel truth,—took captive men's hearts, and made the most lasting impression upon his own and after ages. If Wicliffe was predominantly a man of intellect, Huss was as predominantly a man of feeling, not indeed in the same sense as Luther, in whom feeling was also genius, but still intensely inward, mild, profound. Farther, if Wicliffe was endowed with a will—mighty, resolute, masculine, energetic—so was Huss with a will which was true, unflinching, tenacious. I might say, Wicliffe was a *man* of God, Huss was a *child* of God; but both were heroes in God's host—each according to the gift which the Spirit of God had given him; and in each of them the gifts of the Spirit put themselves forth for the public use. Measured by the standard of intellect, Wicliffe is much the greater man of the two. He is a whole head taller not only than other men, but even than Huss himself. But notwithstanding this, in all that respects character, for his pure and noble nature, for his conscientious piety, and for his victorious constancy in suffering and death, Huss is in every way a worthy successor of Wicliffe, and a worthy representative on the Continent of the same evangelical, scriptural, and christianising principles which Wicliffe maintained in England with so much heroism and steadfastness."

The death of Huss proved the beginning of a new life to Hussitism,—a new life which rose up with tremendous power to preserve the great work of his life from destruction, to

save from annihilation their individual and national independence on questions of religion and the Church, and to repel the invasions of mighty hosts banded together to destroy them. The Hussite war which followed close upon Huss' martyrdom, was the *heroic* age of Bohemian history, and one of the most wonderful chapters in all history. One against a thousand—one small people doing patriotic battle against a Catholic league of most of the great powers of Europe; a series of bloody and ruthless crusades proclaimed by the Pope of Rome, which aimed at nothing short of the complete extirpation of a nation which had dared to think for itself, and threatened to infect all Europe with the leaven of heresy,—and a series of marvellous campaigns, purely defensive at first, and, when they became aggressive, aggressive only for the purpose of effectual defence, not for the conquest of territory, nor for the mere lust of power or revenge; miracles of valour and of generalship done by their leaders, and, foremost of these, by the unconquered and unconquerable Zizka, who continued to win great battles at immense odds, even after he had lost both his eyes; and this terrific contest maintained year after year by a nation of heroes, till all Europe and the Pope himself were fairly compelled, in utter despair of success, to make peace and let the inextinguishable heretics alone: all this wonderful story of patriotism and valour and religious enthusiasm, sprang out of the influence of two minds upon a whole nation,—two minds of which it is hard to say which had most to do with producing the prodigious result. As to Wicliffe, who originated all the new ideas which lay at the root of the movement, the Hussite war is a marvellous instance of the power of great thoughts, when thoughts are practical as well as great. Such knowledge is power indeed,—a power in the life and work and struggles of nations,—a power to wage noble war as well as to make fruitful peace. And as to Huss, his share in producing the movement was rather due to the power of his personality than to any originality in his ideas. His ideas he derived; but the power of his personal character was all his own—the power of his holy and patriotic life, and the power of his grand death, even more than of his life. It was the flames of his martyr-pile that kindled the wide-wasting flames of the Hussite war. His faithfulness unto death, and such a death, rivetted his doctrine in the heart and

conscience of his people for ages. If he had not stood firm in the supreme trial, there would have been no national enthusiasm for him, and no Hussite war. If he had flinched, though only for a time, like his friend Jerome,—if he had first recanted and then recanted his recantation, his weakness, like Cranmer's, might have been forgiven, but Huss would have had no succession of Hussites, as Cranmer had none of Cranmerites; the spell of his influence would have been broken. This mild but mighty Sampson, shorn of his locks, would have become weak like other men. It was Huss impersonating Wicliffe, and teaching the Wicliffe Gospel to a nation by his life and example and martyr-death, that produced the amazing phenomenon of the Hussite defensive wars. What a momentous chapter that was in the history of the world and of civilisation, Palacky shall tell us, in a noble passage taken from the preface to his last work,—"The Documents of the Hussite War." It is a chapter which has been written by him as it was never written before; and the revision and perfecting of his history of it, are to be, he tells us, the last literary care of his life.

"Hussitism is a phenomenon in the history of the world, as highly important as it has been hitherto little known. There is no lack, indeed, of works of merit on John Huss himself, his labours and sufferings; and his teaching has often been handled and commented on from different points of view; his own and his friend Jerome of Prague's undertakings and fortunes, have not been overlooked. But up to the present day men have troubled themselves very little about the after-development and consequences of the movement of mind which they excited; this portion of his story still lies in a somewhat evil condition. Even at this day, the ideas which men are commonly accustomed to associate with the names of the Hussites, the Taborites, Zizka, Prokop, and the like, are not only inappropriate, but unworthy of an enlightened age. For the most part, they are decried as mere firebrands,—as rude, uncultivated fanatics, who in godless rage sought to undermine all order and to destroy all the monuments of civilisation in their time, and so forth; and yet nothing lay further from their intentions than aggression and war. It was not they, but their enemies, who provoked bloodshed and the horrors of a destructive war. Rather, they were the first people in Europe who, not for the sake of earthly possessions, not for the sake of worldly power and dominion, but for the protection of the highest blessings of man threatened with ruin—the right of personal liberty and freedom of conscience, and only when driven by necessity to do so, took up arms and committed themselves to a long war with all the rest of the world, which aimed at nothing less than their entire

annihilation; and who not only committed themselves to the war, but carried it through to a marvellous victory. Huss himself trod a path which many men had trodden before him; but his followers had no predecessors, no example in history which they could copy, —they were the first people upon earth who rose up *en masse* to defend their freedom of thought and conscience, and who for this object put their whole existence at stake. The horrors of war they hurled back upon their enemies, only when it became evident to them that that was the only way left open to them to attain to peace. Those who in our own day still see the only safety of humanity to lie in the dominance of the principle of authority, may condemn, if they will, that proceeding. Their judgment can be no standard for the unprejudiced investigator of history. For if a progress of the human mind, in any sense, was inconceivable without a bursting of the all-enclosing net of that principle, which in the middle ages had the exclusive mastery of the whole world, it is impossible to deny to the Hussites the merit of having been the first to make such a progress possible. Men applaud, it is true, and not without reason, the great effects which followed from the German Reformation of the sixteenth century; but even that Reformation and its comparatively little disturbed development, were due chiefly to the circumstance that the supreme holders of authority had learned by the experience of the Hussite wars the fruitlessness of such interference, and therefore refrained at the beginning of the Reformation movement from bringing to bear upon it their powerful resources of repression. It would therefore be as foolish as it would be unjust and ungrateful, to regard the Hussites with disrespect, and to continue to treat their history with the neglect which has been usual in past times."

We can only touch very briefly on the extent to which Wicliffism, as a system of doctrine and Church principles, passed into the convictions and church-life, first of Huss himself and then of the Hussites. This is a large subject; and when viewed in its whole bearings and latest developments, embracing not only what is usually understood by Hussitism proper, but Bohemian-brethrenism also, both as it stood for seventy years before Luther, and as it was modified under the influences of the Reformation, and down to the time of its last Bishop, Comenius, in the seventeenth century; and again as it passed in the first half of the eighteenth century into the form of Moravianism, or the revived Church of the Unitas Fratrum of Herrnhut, under the protection and guidance of Count Zinzendorf. Our nearly exhausted space will only allow us to sketch the barest outline of a doctrinal and ecclesiastical history which thus extends through several centuries, and which is still represented most honourably by a Mission Church,

whose heralds of salvation are to be found in all the zones both of the Old and the New World.

With regard to Huss himself, he was a true disciple of Wicliffe, in the sense of being thoroughly imbued with the religious and moral spirit of the English Reformer, but not in the sense of having adopted all his doctrines, even on fundamental subjects. He never to the last, *e.g.*, accepted Wicliffe's doctrine of the Lord's Supper as opposed to the dogma of transubstantiation; and when required and pressed by the Council to recant a considerable number of other articles, in which it was thought he agreed with Wicliffe, the only reason he assigned for refusing to recant them was, not that they were true, but that he had never held them nor taught them. How could he, as an honest man, pretend to recant what he had never believed or professed? And on Church questions as well, he was far from going all lengths with the great English logician. Huss was much more a moral and practical theologian and churchman, than a logical or speculative one. His quarrel with the Papacy itself was much more on account of its abuse of the powers it claimed, than on account of the usurped and anti-scriptural character of the powers themselves. He was willing to die at the stake rather than withdraw his protest against the corruptions of the Church, and the Anti-Christian use which the Popes made of their authority against Christian truth and obedience to the will and law of Christ Himself. But he was not, in the strict and full sense of the term, a consequential thinker. He did not reason things out to their very last intellectual issues; he was more heroic in action than in thought; he shrunk from no extremes of suffering and self-sacrifice to which duty called him when the line of duty was once made plain to him; but he had none of that heroism of intellect which pursues truth of thought to its last results, and shrinks from nothing in the conclusion which with strong insight it sees to be involved in the premisses. Wicliffe was both a giant and a hero in intellect. Huss' chief power and mastery lay in the sphere of conscience and duty towards God and towards man.

But multitudes of the Hussites went far beyond Huss. Even before his death, while he was still a prisoner in Constance, the Hussites of Prague demanded that the cup in the eucharist should be restored to the laity of the Church, a demand which

he had never made himself, though he concurred in it as soon as it was put forward by his friends; and in this particular development of Hussitism there was always afterwards complete unanimity among the Hussites. But that was the only point in advance in which they could ever be unanimous. The whole Bohemian nation, with the exception of a small minority of Romanists, was stirred by his noble and affecting martyrdom to embrace his cause, and to call themselves by his honoured name, but they soon parted off into two great divisions,—the Utraquists, or the Calixtines, who were the Hussite conservatives—and the Taborites, who were the party of progress, the radical Hussites: and to these opposite extremes was erelong, of course, added a middle party, led by the famous Zizka, the generalissimo of the nation, and called the party of the Orphans. In these two latter sections of the nation, the doctrines of Wicliffe were much more fully accepted and carried out than among the Utraquists. The Taborites and the Orphans were both, in a word, in different degrees Hussite *Puritans;* as in the next century there arose, under the Reformation, Protestants of the Puritan type as well as of the Conservative Church type; and in both of these Puritan parties of Bohemia, the Moderate and the Extreme, the principles of Wicliffe were carried out much beyond the point which had been reached by Huss himself. The halting, inconsequential position of the Utraquists was abandoned, and going beyond Wicliffe himself, the Taborites, in many instances, ran out into extremes of principle and practice, which in the end, and ere very long, resulted in the decay and final downfall and extinction of the party as first constituted.

Then arose out of the ruins of Taborism, about the middle of the fifteenth century, the interesting and truly Christian Church of the Unitas Fratrum, or the Bohemian Brethren. It united the doctrines of Wicliffe with the spiritual and moral earnestness of Huss and the earliest Hussites. It was the best and truest Church-realisation of the teaching and life both of Wicliffe and Huss,—though in some things it differed from both, under the influence of the Waldensian Church, which had then numerous representatives either in Bohemia or in the countries nearest to it, with whom the Brethren found themselves more in sympathy and accord than with their Utraquistic countrymen; and between whom and them there

sprang up a closeness of intercourse which led on both sides to a considerable amalgamation of doctrine and practice.

It was in this ecclesiastical condition that the Reformation of the 16th century found the Hussite kingdom and Church. It was hailed with equal joy by both the Hussite parties, and from it both were willing to accept improvements alike in their teaching and practice. The Bohemian people shewed their gratitude for these benefits, and their deep sense of unity with the Reformation, by refusing to bear arms against the Elector of Saxony and the other evangelical princes of Germany, in the disastrous war which broke up the Schmalkald League and drove John the Magnanimous from his electoral throne. The reaction which followed the Protestant catastrophe in Saxony, in the days of the Interim, did not extend to Bohemia; and the Hussite Church there, consisting of the same two sections which had descended from the fifteenth century, maintained itself steadily as a Reformed Church down to the outbreak, in 1620, of the thirty years' war. The old successes in war of the Hussite arms under Zizka, unfortunately, could not be repeated under the banners of Frederick of the Palatinate, whom the revolted kingdom had chosen to be their king. In the fatal battle of the White Mountain, fought at the very gates of Prague, all the liberties of the kingdom, both political and religious, were lost. Bohemia was compelled, by force of arms, to submit to a double restoration—both of the old throne and of the old Church. The house of Austria, in the person of Ferdinand, a disciple of the Jesuits, equal in bigotry and intolerance to the worst of his masters, joined hands with the Pope on the soil of Hüss and of Zizka. All that Huss and Zizka had done was undone,—Hussitism was proscribed and exterminated,—and Romanism took its place, under the double guarantee of the military despotism of Vienna and the Jesuit soldiery of the Pope. The Utraquists, the Bohemian Brethren, the Waldensians, and the Lutherans, all ceased to exist in the land, or existed only in dark corners; persecution raged; the churches were given back to the priests; the Protestant pastors were driven out of the kingdom; and the people in all parts of the kingdom had only to choose between conforming to the Romish worship, or going into perpetual exile from the land of their fathers.

PETER LORIMER.

## ART. II.—*The Church and the Synagogue.*

### 1. BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

WHILST the history of the chosen people has occupied the attention and engaged the pens of some of the ablest writers of whom the world of literature can boast, that particular aspect of it which might have been thought most deeply interesting, especially to the Christian student, has been strangely and systematically neglected. Those authors who in modern times have entered most minutely into the history of the Jewish *diaspora*, such as Milman and Jost and Grätz, glance only casually and in passing at the conversion of individual Jews to the Christian faith. There have not been wanting, it is true, attempts to define critically the relation of the synagogue to the church, both before and after the Reformation, and by Jewish as well as Christian writers. But these attempts have for the most part failed, owing to their authors having assumed, as the starting-point of their criticism, the peculiar theological standpoint of a particular age in the church's development. For this reason the works of such authors as Wagenseil and Müller, however valuable in other respects, are of little practical use to the student who would gain a clear idea of the attitude mutually assumed towards each other by Judaism and Christianity since the beginning of the Christian era, and of the influence exerted by the latter on the former at different periods. The only tolerably successful attempt to supply this want is that made a few years ago by Dr Kalkar in his little work, "*Israel und die Kirche*," in which he gives a sketch of the leading features of Jewish history in the *diaspora* in Christian lands, and of the most notable conversions that have taken place in the different centuries. A very interesting article by Pressel, in Herzog's "Encyclopædia," on "Das Volk Gottes," is partially devoted to the same subject, but is wanting in the *minutiæ* which render Kalkar's *brochure*, in this respect, so valuable.

The field is so wide, and the approaches to it so numerous, that an exhaustive review of it in all its aspects would be impossible within the limits of an article or two. All we propose attempting, therefore, in this and a succeeding paper, is

to glance rapidly at the more prominent landmarks presented by the history of the subject; noting a few of the more remarkable conversions which have occurred at various times; and concluding by venturing to suggest at least a partial reorganisation of Christian effort in Jewish mission fields. We shall follow, in the main, the line marked out by Kalkar and Pressel.

The first Christian Church consisted exclusively of Hebrews; and during the first two centuries the gospel made more rapid progress among them than among the Gentiles. The fierce conflicts which Paul had to sustain with the zealots of his race are proof of the bitter hostility with which Christianity was regarded by them; yet during the lifetime of that apostle it could be reported to the brethren at Jerusalem concerning "the many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous for the law." It is calculated that up till the time of the Emperor Hadrian (A.D. 120) fifteen bishops of the Church of Jerusalem had been converts from Judaism.

During the siege, in the interval of rest which followed the arrival of the news from Italy that the legions had elected Vespasian to the imperial throne, the Christians of Jerusalem remembered the word of the Lord, and fled from the doomed city to Pella, in the hills. But soon after the close of the war they returned, and formed anew a Jewish-Christian community around the ruined walls of the temple of their fathers. Symeon, the son of Cleophas, a relative of the Lord, was elected bishop, and for a time the church enjoyed prosperity and peace. But it was of short duration. Soon the old controversy as to whether the Mosaic law was binding on Christians, was revived. Hence arose the new sect of Ebionites, as the stricter Jewish-Christian party were called from this time onwards. We are not here concerned with the peculiar tenets of this sect. It will be enough to remember that the Ebionites held fast to the law in all its strictness, to the Jewish Sabbath, and to circumcision; whilst on the other hand they tried to unite, in a curious fashion, their Judaistic observances with the Christian faith. The more liberal members of the Jewish-Christian Church were known as the Nazarenes; and after the founding of the new *Ælia Capitolina* on the site of the ancient Jerusalem, and the suppression by Hadrian of the rebellion of the *pseudo*-Messias, Bar Cochba, they became

incorporated with the Gentile-Christian Church at Jerusalem, then presided over by the bishop Mark.

As Christianity spread among the Gentiles, the Jewish-Christian element gradually sank into increasing obscurity, or relapsed into Judaism. Thus, we find Epiphanius, in the fourth century, characterizing the Ebionites, and those of the Nazarenes who had not coalesced with the Gentile party in the Church, as heretics. True Christianity, which regards neither Jew nor Greek, spread gradually, but mightily, among the nations, and in the end gained a complete victory, not only over the eclectic systems of the Ebionites and Gnostics, but also over Arianism itself, which we may regard as the last stronghold, the latest development, of Jewish Christology. It was the Council of Nice which, by crystallizing Christian doctrines into definite formulæ, finally severed the last bond of union between the Church and the synagogue. Hitherto their lines had met and crossed at many points; but when the first day of the week was formally declared to be the Christian Sabbath, and especially when the time of the Easter celebration was fixed by the Church, tradition owned itself vanquished, and Judaism assumed towards Christianity that attitude of fierce and bitter antagonism which it has maintained till the present hour.

Conscious ascendancy soon begat a spirit of persecution. Constantine, the first of the Christian emperors, issued a number of edicts against those Jews who should seek to prevent others of their faith from becoming converts to Christianity (*vide* Jost iv. p. 250). Any relapse into Judaism was punished with confiscation of the backslider's property. It does not appear, however, that these extreme measures were in all cases approved of by the Church; for in the writings of that period which are still extant, we find frequent complaints that those penal statutes, for the most part, only resulted in bringing over to Christianity multitudes of Jews and heathen of the baser sort, whose conversion was only external, and whose hearts still held fast to the ancient faith.

The most celebrated proselytes of those stormy controversial times were Barnabas, Ariston of Pella, and, somewhat later in the fourth century, Epiphanius.

Shortly after the death of Constantine, there took place at Liberias the very remarkable conversion of the Jewish

patriarch Hillel, a lineal descendant of Gamaliel. From the detailed account given by Epiphanius of the event, it appears that the patriarch had long occupied himself in secret in searching the Scriptures of the New Testament, and had even translated the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles into Hebrew. Feeling his end approaching, he desired the Christian bishop to be summoned, and after confessing his faith, was baptized in the name of Jesus. Before his death he handed a large sum of money to the bishop for distribution among the poorer priests of the Church. A witness of this secret confession and baptism was a learned and respected Jew, called Joseph, upon whom the solemn scene made so deep and lasting an impression, that he too devoted himself to the study of the New Testament, and was finally publicly baptised. He was subsequently raised to the rank of *Comes* of the imperial court, and was able in this influential position to render material service to the Church. It was owing to him that Christian churches were established in Sepphoris, Nazareth, and Capernaum.

But by far the most eminent name among the proselytes of the age, was that of Epiphanius, to whom reference has already been made, and to whom we owe many curious and valuable writings still extant. He was born at Bezanduca, a village in the neighbourhood of Eleutheropolis, about the year 310. The story of his conversion has been so obscured by monkish legends, that it is impossible to arrive at any absolute certainty regarding it. It may, however, be taken as established that the kindness he experienced at the hands of a certain monk called Lucius, during a time of persecution, produced so lasting an impression upon him, that he ultimately resolved to embrace the faith of his benefactor, After his baptism he became an eager defender of the Catholic doctrine. He founded a monastery in his native place, over which he presided himself. Subsequently he was translated as presbyter to Constantia (Salamis), in the island of Cyprus, where he was eventually raised to the rank of a bishop. In his new office he retained the simplicity of his old monkish life, and manifested all his former zeal in defence and propagation of the faith. But along with his deep piety, and in spite of it, he remained till the last narrow-minded in his views, and incapable of that broad, liberal toleration for the opinions of others, which is indicative of the highest development of

Christian culture. He published a work, entitled "Panarion," in which he enumerated eighty old and new heresies, comparing them with as many serpents. Fearlessly he denounced Origen as a heretic, fulminated from the pulpit against John of Jerusalem, announced to Hieronymus that he could no longer maintain Christian fellowship with him, and even went so far as to condemn Chrysostom as an unworthy son of the Church. He died at an advanced age, in the year 403.

Another case of conversion falling within the same period, and likewise enveloped in much legendary obscurity, is worthy of mention. Basil, the great Bishop of Cæsarea, had a Jewish physician in his household, who was much attached to his patron. On one occasion, in the year 379, he was hastily summoned to attend the bishop, who, attacked by sudden illness, lay at the point of death. On entering the sick man's chamber, his experienced eye at once detected the presence of the most urgent danger. The prospect of losing his master moved him to tears. The bishop endeavoured to comfort him by telling him he had prayed for recovery, and felt assured his prayer had been accepted, and that he should be spared. The skilled leech thought it impossible. But, contrary to all expectation, the sick man began immediately to amend, and recovered so rapidly, that on the following day he was able to celebrate the Eucharist in the church. The Jew was conquered by this proof of the power of believing prayer, and was baptized with his whole house.

Another legend, dating about a hundred years later, may also be noticed. There existed at that time in the interior of Arabia a Jewish colony, under the name of Homerites, whose king was a zealous persecutor of the Christians. The story goes that Gregentius, Bishop of Tapra, in Arabia (*ob.* 552), once held a disputation among this people before a mixed assembly of Jews and Christians. His opponent in the discussion was a learned Jew, Herbanus, whom all the arguments of the Christian doctor proved powerless to convince. Finally Herbanus declared he would not believe unless Jesus Christ should then and there appear to him in person. Suddenly the Lord appeared in His glory in the midst of the assembly, and was seen of all the Christians present; but the Jews, in punishment for their unbelief, were smitten with blindness, with the exception of one aged Rabbi, who arose

and exclaimed with a loud voice, "Jesus of Nazareth is the true God, and I believe in Him." This testimony produced no less a result than that Herbanus and five hundred thousand other Jews were baptised in one day!

The centuries following the death of Constantine were marked by the struggles of the Church against the inroads of Arian, Pelagian, and Nestorian heresy. Sharper measures were adopted, and more stringent edicts issued against heretics, among whom were now expressly included Jews and Samaritans. The older fathers had advocated the cause of religious toleration and liberty of conscience. But in the heat of polemic warfare, the Church forgot the moderation of its founders, and boldly demanded from the State the suppression of Judaism and heathenism by force. Many Jews, therefore, made outward confession of Christianity, in order to escape persecution; and the number of those who thus outwardly conformed was largely increased by the severity with which they were uniformly treated by the Mohammedans. The Church alone was powerful enough to protect its adherents in those stormy times from the fury of the followers of the Prophet (*vide* Milman, i. c. iii. 65). Subsequently, too, the Jews were involved in the sufferings of the Montanists. Leo the Isaurian[1] persecuted both parties alike, and compelled many of the former to submit to baptism. Better days dawned upon them when the Emperor Basilius began to reign. Convinced that faith cannot be forced, this enlightened monarch laboured to gain converts from Judaism by the gentler means of public discussions on the evidences of Christianity. He removed many of the burdens under which the Hebrews groaned, and, as an old chronicler quaintly reports, "in this way took away the veil from the eyes of many."

It appears, therefore, that for some centuries immediately following the death of the first Christian emperor, the Church manifested an increasing tendency to stamp out Judaism by legislative and penal measures. It is not surprising, accordingly, that among the proselytes of that time, with the exception of Epiphanius, few names are found of men eminent in piety, or distinguished for their learning. All that can with any certainty be gathered regarding the relations between the two parties in those dark legendary ages, marked

[1] See Pressel: das Volk Gottes. Herzog, xvii. p. 331 f.

more by monkish superstition and fanatical bigotry than enlightenment in the pursuit or zeal for the propagation of the truth, is that the most learned fathers of the Church gladly availed themselves of the help of Jewish doctors, in order to arrive at a more accurate and literal meaning of the Hebrew Scriptures. And through this connection in scholarship and kindred pursuits, an intercourse, more or less confidential, was established, which in many instances resulted in the conversion of individuals. Friendships were formed, growing out of mutual esteem, that sometimes led to Christian fellowship. On the death of the distinguished Bishop Hilary of Poictiers (368), a large concourse of Jews followed his bier to the grave, chanting their grand old Hebrew Psalms, and stood afterwards with uncovered heads, reverently silent, whilst the Christian mourners engaged in prayer in the name of Jesus. Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea (*ob.* 390), whilst boldly defending the truth of Christian doctrine against Judaistic error, nevertheless knew how to gain the respect and love of a wide circle of Jewish friends.

Our limits forbid us to follow the story of Israel and the Church in all the lands where the two have come into collision. And the record, if attempted, would not only be tedious, but also monotonous. For the story in its main features is singularly uniform. In all lands the Jews have been treated with the same merciless cruelty, and their most bitter enemy has been in every instance the Catholic Church. Let us therefore select one page only from the many-leaved narrative, and, from a rapid survey of the history in a particular case, learn how Israel fared at the hands of Christendom in general during the middle ages.

In no European country have darker stains fallen on the white livery of Christianity than in Spain. Intolerance and bigotry, merciless persecution and unrelenting cruelty,—such have been the most prominent characteristics of Spanish Catholicism in all past ages. And, notwithstanding the boasted progress and enlightenment of the present, recent events have shewn that the old cruel spirit is not dead, that the fire still smoulders under the ashes, that the sword is not yet rusted in the scabbard. Let but the Carlist cause prosper in that unhappy land, and soon the spark will kindle again into flame, and the sword leap forth to smite new victims. It

is a dark page in the history of the Church which sets forth the relation between Catholicism and Judaism in Spain. Let us glance briefly over the record.

After the dispersion, Spain soon became one of the most favourite refuges of the exiled Hebrews. At what period the wanderers first began to seek its shores it is impossible to determine. There is nothing glaringly improbable in the old tradition, that as early as the reign of Solomon a Jewish colony emigrated thither for the purpose of trading with the Phœnicians. It is possible that vast numbers, driven from their homes by the Chaldeans, and later also by the Romans, journeyed across North Africa to the Peninsula. It is at all events certain that in the apostolic age a very considerable Jewish population had established themselves in the country. Nay, from the fact that Paul intended to proceed thither, and hints at this purpose in his Epistle to the Romans,—intimating that his stay in Rome itself should be only a passing sojourn on his way to the farther west,—we might even be justified in concluding that a larger number of Jews had settled in Spain than in the capital of the world. And, at whatever period they had come, it is also certain that in the earlier ages of the Church's history the Sephardim were numerous and powerful in the land, and that specially friendly relations subsisted between them and the Christians around them. This harmony must ultimately have threatened danger to the stability and purity of the Church, for we find edicts emanating from the Council of Elvira (320) calculated to cause a breach in the intercourse of the two parties, by forbidding Christians to have the fruits of their fields and vineyards blessed by Jews, or even to eat in their company. So long, however, as the West Goths, who ruled in Spain remained faithful to Arian doctrine, the Jews were suffered to dwell in peace and security of life and goods. But when King Reccared embraced the Catholic faith, and began to persecute his former brethren, the Arians, an effort was made to root out Judaism at the same time with fire and sword, in case its adherents refused to become Christians. The rigours of persecution increased under King Sisebut, who, in his zeal, forced multitudes to submit to baptism. Thousands fled across the Pyrenees into France, but it is calculated that no fewer than 90,000 were compelled

to be baptised, though, as Milman significantly adds, "how far their hearts renounced their creed, or how speedily they relapsed, must remain uncertain." The strong protests of the most eminent and best of the fathers of the Spanish Church, such as Isidore of Seville, and Ildephonso of Toledo, proved powerless to check these cruelties, which increased in violence till the times of King Erwig and his son-in-law and successor, Egiza. The latter procured an edict from the basely subservient Council of Toledo (694), in the spirit of which he banished all Jews from the country, selling vast numbers of them into slavery. This decree of expulsion, however, cannot have been put in force, or must soon have been revoked, for in the next reign we find the Jews in Spain as numerous as ever.

About this time a very curious phenomenon manifested itself among the Spanish clergy. Notwithstanding the rigorous persecution carried on against the Jews, many priests deserted the Church and embraced Judaism. It is said that not a few, even among the higher dignitaries of the Church, while continuing outwardly to conform, submitted to circumcision in secret.

The most remarkable proselyte of this stormy age was Julian of Toledo, the author of a work in refutation of Judaism, entitled "The Sixth Millenium in the History of the World." He became, after his baptism, the intimate friend of the pious deacon Gudika. The two friends determined to embrace together the monastic life. But the death of the Metropolitan Quiritius of Toledo crossed their resolve, Julian being immediately elevated to the vacant See as his successor. As Metropolitan of Toledo, he now began to exercise a wide and beneficial influence over the Spanish Church. In many districts he succeeded in checking the fanatic spirit of persecution against his brethren of the seed of Abraham. A well-known Spanish historian thus sums up his description of this "Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile":

"Always diligent and earnest in prayer, and neglectful of no service of God, his benevolence was specially remarkable; he needed only to hear of a case of want or distress, and straightway he began to devise ways and means of help. No less was he distinguished for his righteousness than for his gentleness and energy. He was silent and grave in deportment, but always ready for any work that needed to be done, and withal

so kindly and approachable, that every one who came in contact with him received the impression of a man well-pleasing unto God and men. Himself a strict observer of all the Church's laws, he strove with all his might to make the clergy subject to him likewise conform, in their lives and actions, to the same wholesome discipline. A declared enemy of vice in every form, he laboured earnestly to destroy it. In addition to his other virtues, he was remarkable for his humility."[1]

After playing a useful and honourable part in most of the great religious and controversial movements of his time, he died in the year 690, sorrowed for by the whole Church of Spain, which lost in him its brightest ornament, and by the Jews, who had found in him a powerful protector against intolerance and persecution.

The violent measures to which we have alluded, and which culminated in cruelty under King Egiza, brought little gain to the cause of Christianity. In the dark and troublous days that were about to dawn over Spain, the multitudes of "New-Christians" who had been driven by force to the baptismal font proved an element of weakness and danger to the Church when assailed by the might of the Moslem. Whilst there is no positive proof that the Moors were actually invited into Spain by the Jews, groaning under Christian tyranny, yet it is certain they were everywhere hailed by them with acclamations as their deliverers. In not a few instances did the Jews make common cause with the invaders as armed allies. And the "New-Christians," especially, when the crescent rose in triumph over the hills of Spain, forsook in vast numbers the alien Christian fold into which they had been driven by violence, and joyfully returned to their ancient allegiance. It is true there were some brilliant exceptions amid the universal jubilant defection, one of which may be here referred to. Alvarez of Cordova, a baptised Jew, and friend of the martyr Eulogius, whose life he wrote, remained true to the Christian faith. He laboured with all his might to prevent his fellow-converts from apostatising, and wrote several works in praise of those who preferred martyrdom to dishonour. He was filled with horror at the conduct of the priests, who, in many instances, became Moslems in order to save their lives.

It is beyond our province, even did our space permit it, to attempt here any detailed account of the downfall of the Gothic, and the rise of the Saracen power in Spain. It will

[1] Ferrara, II. p. 453.

suffice to remember that about the beginning of the eighth century, when the empire of the West Goths, shaken by internal discord, was tottering to ruin, there came swarming over the narrow seas from North Africa those mixed hordes of Arabs and Berbers, to whom history has given the common designation of Moors. On the 11th of June 711, King Roderick and his host were vanquished, and the overthrow of the Gothic dominion consummated on the fatal field of Xeres de la Frontera, in the neighbourhood of Cadiz. Elated by victory, the invaders pursued their conquests. Cordova and the ancient royal city of Toledo opened their gates to the conquerors, who, reinforced by fresh arrivals from Africa, next crossed the Pyrenees and penetrated into France as far as Bordeaux. But under the walls of Tours they received so signal a defeat from Charles Martel and his Frankish levies, that they were forced to retreat in haste again beyond the mountains into Spain. Here also they endured some fresh reverses. In the North, in the Basque provinces, in Asturia, in Gallicia, they were unable to maintain the footing they had previously gained. Only in the South they succeeded in establishing a new empire, subject at first to the Kaliphs of Damascus, but afterwards, on the overthrow of the dynasty of the Omijades in the East, independent and free. Whilst in the East the Kaliphate gradually sank into increasing decrepitude and anarchy,—whilst France, after the death of the earlier Carolingians, seemed relapsing into its former barbarism, the new empire of the Omijades in the West rose steadily in importance and civilisation, till Spain at length stood at the head of the nations in culture, in learning, in arts and sciences. In this progress the Jews shared equally with the new comers, and to a larger extent than the conquered Spaniards. They enjoyed freedom from persecution, and even succeeded in obtaining from their Moorish rulers charters for their protection in the future. Even in those parts where the Christians had managed to maintain their independence, the Jews likewise enjoyed peace so long as the threatening presence of the Mohammedan power kept the authorities in awe in Asturia and Leon and Castille. It is true the former edicts against them remained in force, but since the overthrow of the West Gothic dominion, these were never executed. Many of the highest offices in the State were filled by them under the Moorish sovereigns.

So long as the Saracen power remained in the ascendant, the relation between the Church and the Synagogue was thus one of armed and watchful neutrality. Each distrusted the other; and both were too much under the strong hand of the Moslem for either to venture on independent measures of persecution or revenge. But when Mohammedan influence began to wane throughout the land, the Christian States renewed their former efforts against Judaism, and evinced a melancholy energy in putting the old cruel edicts once more in force. From this time onwards we find on every page of Spanish history dark tales of blood and cruelty, one long record of bigotry and intolerance. Especially in the crusading age was a mighty impulse lent to the evil spirit which had entered into Christian counsels. In the excited fanaticism of the time, men began to ask, Why go forth to smite the infidel in far distant lands, when here, in our midst, we find the bitterest of all the enemies of our Lord? With such spirits muttering in the air, it is no wonder that the rallying cry of the ignorant soon became, "Death or baptism!"

Still, however, the gentle voice of the Spirit of Christ did not cease to speak to many Jewish hearts of the grace and beauty of the true religion He had founded. Even when persecution was sorest there were not wanting some hearts touched of God to receive the true meaning of that Christianity, which so-called Christians were darkening with streams of blood. Among these was Pedro Alphonso, who, prior to his baptism, bore the name of Moses. He was the court physician of King Alphonso VI., who stood sponsor at his baptism in 1106. He published a work in which, in the form of a dialogue carried on between a certain Moses (himself before his conversion) and another called Pedro (himself as Christian), he exposed the errors of Judaism, and justified his own recantation of them. A notable feature of this work, and a rare one in that age, is the total absence of all bitterness and railing.

Among other celebrated proselytes of the period, may be mentioned Johannes de Valladolid and Johannes Conversus. Reference may also be made to the celebrated disputation which Raymund de Pennaforte caused to be held in the royal palace at Barcelona between the proselyte Paolo and Rabbi Moses ben Nachman.[1]

[1] *Vide* Grätz *Gesch. VII.* p. 143.

The time was now rapidly approaching when the might of the Saracen was to be broken in Europe. One after another their rich possessions in Spain were wrested from their grasp. We are not here concerned with the history of the expulsion of the Moors, or the irreparable injury which Spain inflicted on itself in driving from its shores the most enlightened and enterprising of its citizens. We have only to remark how, as the Moslem power declined, the old unholy hatred of the Jews grew into fresh persecutions in the Christian States, more terrible than the former, owing to the victims having so long enjoyed immunity from fanatic fury. The cry, "Death or baptism!" again resounded through the land. And when multitudes purchased a momentary escape by submitting to the rite, though they remained in their hearts attached to their own faith, and continued to perform its ceremonies in secret, the Inquisition was on the alert with its vengeful arm to prevent their escape.

Since the year 1320, there had existed in the south of France a class of fanatics drawn from the dregs of the populace, and calling themselves *pastoureaux* or cattle-herds. Suddenly the madness of these wretched men took shape and method in a war of extermination against the Jews. The fire of fanaticism was fanned into fresh flame by the excitement caused in the popular mind by the terrible Black Death then sweeping through central Europe. The movement spread at length over the Pyrenees into the heart of Spain, where many thousands of Jews were put to death with the most fearful tortures. Wherever the Sephardim have found a home in Europe, the year 1391 is still regarded by them as one of the blackest in the chequered history of their ancestors. The immediate cause of the outbreak of the massacre in Spain was a sermon preached in the Cathedral of Seville by Ferdinand Martinez, Archbishop of Nublo. The theme of the discourse was the stiffnecked obstinacy of the Jews in refusing to accept the clearest evidences of the truth of Christianity. Excited to fury by the fiery eloquence of the preacher, the mob rushed from the church, and forthwith began an indiscriminate slaughter in the Jewish quarter of the defenceless wretches who were quite unprepared for the onslaught. Thus the brand was lighted in a Christian Church, whose lurid destroying flame spread over Spain, filling the towns and villages of all the land with

mourning. It is calculated that no fewer than twenty thousand Jews submitted to baptism in this one year in order to escape slaughter.

Two men were remarkable in this century above all others for the zeal with which they prosecuted the work of proselytism among the Jews—Vincentius Ferrer, and Hieronymus de Sancta Fide. The former, a Dominican monk, was at first a theological professor at Barcelona. But being an eloquent preacher, and moreover filled with an energy and burning zeal that refused to be satisfied with the narrow path marked out for it in an academic career, he soon attracted the notice of Cardinal de Luna, who appointed him his confessor. He accompanied his patron into France, and when the latter was elected Pope, under the title of Benedict XIII., Ferrer shared with him the gilded exile of Avignon. We next find him at the head of the flagellant friars traversing Germany, France, Italy, and Spain. Everywhere he attracted vast crowds by the eloquence of his preaching. Following the example of the Apostle Paul, he made it his custom, in all the cities and towns he visited, to enter into the synagogues and dispute with the attendant rabbis on the grounds of faith in the Christian doctrine. It is not surprising that numerous legends have clustered about his name of miracles wrought by him, and of crowds of Jews converted to the truth by his preaching. No fewer than thirty-five thousand are said to have been convinced by his sermons of the errors of Judaism, and to have submitted to baptism at his hands. The monkish chroniclers of the age ascribe to him, moreover, an extraordinary influence even over those Jews who refused to embrace Christianity. He died at Vannes, in the year 1419, and was canonised by Calixtus III. about forty years later.

Hieronymus de Sancta Fide, or, as he was known among the circumcision prior to his conversion, Joseph Hallorki, was equally distinguished as a learned Talmudist and skilled physician. After he was baptised, he became an eager controversialist of Judaism, and laboured both with tongue and pen to induce his brethren to embrace Christianity. It was at his instigation that the famous conference, under de Lyra's presidency, was held at Tortosa. The disputation lasted over sixty sessions, beginning on the 7th February 1413, and closing on the 12th November 1414. The discussion covered all the

points in dispute between the two parties, and was con
with unusual pomp and solemnity. As usual, the Chr
claimed the victory. The result of most importance fo
present is, that all the rabbis who had taken part
proceedings, with the exception of two, consented to be ba
The two who remained obdurate were Vidal Halle
Isaac ben Nathan. The latter is best known as the co
of the earliest Concordance of the Hebrew Scriptures.

By far the most eminent proselyte of this centu
Paul of Burgos, one of the most pious prelates of the S
Church, and the most distinguished scholar of his age
Jewish name was Salomon Hallevi. He was led to e
Christianity from reading the works of Thomas Aqu
the perusal of which he was probably induced to
himself by the influence of Ferrer. He received the d
of Doctor of Theology from Paris, and rose to high dig
the Church. In consequence of the learning displayed
sermons which, as Archdeacon, he preached before the
Avignon, he was appointed Bishop of Carthagena, and
quently of Burgos, his native city. He enjoyed the
favour of King Henry III., who made him custodian
will, in which he appointed him guardian of his son, J
and chancellor of the kingdom during the latter's m
His three sons,[1] born to him previous to his conversi
baptised along with him, likewise rose to high honours
the Church and in the State. Alphonso, the eldest, suc
his father in the episcopate of Burgos, and was prese
took an active part in the proceedings of the Council o
where, by his eloquence in debate and suavity of man
received from Eneas Sylvius the appellation "*deliciæ H
Orum.*" The second son, Gonsalvo, became Bishop of Pl
and represented his sovereign at the Council of Co
The third, Alvarez Garcia de St Maria, was a states
eminence, and the progenitor of some of the noblest
in Spain. Paulus died at a very advanced age in 143

Towards the end of this century the Church gained
celebrated convert from Judaism, in the person of Jo
Baptista, a physician of renown in his day. A very
work of his, entitled "A Refutation of the Jewish Se

[1] Da Costa mentions *four*. See "Israel und die Volker," p. 230. German translation.)

dedicated to Cardinal Bernardo Carnavajal, is still extant. In the dedicatory epistle he appeals to the Cardinal to procure from the Pope an edict compelling the Jews to read his book. In the preface, which contains an address to his brethren after the flesh, he informs them that he himself had not been convinced of the truth of the Gospel by any of the ordinary arguments current in the controversy of the day. He had not been forced to submit to baptism; neither had he sought it out of avarice or vanity; and still less owing to any want of acquaintance with Judaism, for from childhood he had been familiar with the Hebrew and Talmudic Scriptures. He had learned the truth of Christianity from his own independent study of the ancient prophets. Consequently he comes forward as an unbiassed witness, and, confident that by searching the Scriptures his brethren must attain to the same light, he implores them not to close their ears against the message he brings them from the sacred fountain of their own national prophecy. The work itself consists of three parts, in the last of which he discusses the various obstacles that lie between the Jew and the Cross, these being chiefly hypocrisy, superstition, avarice, and pride.

Hitherto the popes, with a few notable exceptions, had on the whole acted liberally and tolerantly towards the Jews in Spain. But there now began to obtain a very different policy. Immediately after the Conference of Tortosa, mentioned above, Benedict XIII. issued a Bull against them, more threatening in its terms, and more severe in its enactments than any which had hitherto appeared. Paul VI. and Pius V. adopted the same line, only with increased severity. In consequence of these papal threats, and the oppression that followed in their wake, multitudes of Jews became unwilling members of the Church in order to escape the now intolerable taxes imposed upon them for the support of the Catholic clergy, and mercilessly levied in the case of all who refused to conform. About this time we find the Spanish bishops uniting in a complaint to the King, that their incomes were materially diminished, owing to the vast numbers who flocked to the font to escape taxation by becoming Christians. The Church had gained a victory over the Synagogue, but at best an equivocal one, as the episcopal petition clearly shews.

These mushroom conversions mark the beginning of a new

period of persecution and suffering more terrible than anything Spain had ever yet witnessed. Vast numbers of Jews had accepted baptism solely to purchase safety for life and goods, whilst in secret they still observed their religious ceremonies as before. Thus they incurred not only the loathing of their former brethren for their apostasy, but also the suspicion of the Church by their reluctant and half-hearted performance of Christian service. The result was that, hated by the Jews, and distrusted by the Church, their condition became miserable in the extreme. Not unfrequently were they held up to the mockery of the ignorant by those false shepherds to whose guidance they had committed themselves, and who ought to have been their protectors. Cruel mobs, worked up to a white heat of fanaticism by the tirades of the priests, especially on the great feast days, broke into their dwellings, plundering the rich and massacring the defenceless. Surrounded with spies, exposed to calumny on all sides, their most trivial actions malevolently noted and reported, the smallest occasion served to draw down upon them with merciless cruelty the penalties of backsliding and heresy. Their sufferings increased, rather than diminished, after the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella. This event, the beginning of a new era of material prosperity and national glory for Spain, and which seemed at one time to promise the dawning of a brighter day for the unhappy Hebrews, proved in the end the commencement of a persecution that ultimately culminated in the expulsion of all Jews from Spain. The union of the crowns of Arragon and Castille was followed by the introduction of the Inquisition. Ferdinand vied with an ignorant and fanatical priesthood in plundering the miserable Maranos equally with their brethren who had not been baptised. No age or sex was spared. Especially after the appointment of the infamous Torquemada to the office of chief inquisitor, the sky was daily darkened by the smoke that rose to heaven, witnessing against blood, from a hundred torture-fires. Every village had its *auto-da-fè*. Among the Sephardim there is hardly a family of note that cannot point in its ancestral roll to one or more names of those who in that bloody age perished either by fire or sword. At last, on the 31st of March 1492, just after the conquest of Granada, and the final overthrow and expulsion of the Moors, a royal decree was published, commanding all Jews to depart from the country

within a period of four months. This was the heaviest blow that had as yet fallen upon them; and strenuous were the efforts they made to avert it. The richest and most learned of their nation—men like Abarbanel, so eminent in position that even the Inquisition was forced to wink at their heresy—laboured to induce the King to annul the decree, and permit them to remain. It is probable that the monarch would have yielded, had not the hand of the holy office been heavy upon him. History has preserved to us one curious scene which illustrates the weakness of the Crown in that age, when once the fiat of the Church had gone forth. Abarbanel had been admitted to a private audience with Ferdinand in the royal cabinet. He had offered the king an immense sum, in gold and precious stones, to purchase exemption for his brethren. Partly dazzled by the glittering wealth, partly moved by the eloquent pleading of the advocate, Ferdinand seemed about to yield. Suddenly Torquemada burst into the chamber, and holding aloft in his right hand a crucifix, thus addressed his sovereign: "Judas sold his Lord for thirty pieces of silver; your majesty is about to sell Him for thirty thousand ducats. There He is; make your bargain." The decree remained in force, and Spain again saw thousands of her most industrious and enlightened citizens leaving her shores to pass away into uncertain and miserable exile. Not, however, without leaving their mark behind them, cut deep into the history of the nation which had disowned and cast them out. For not a few of the noblest families in Spain, families that have given brave warriors and wise statesmen to the public service, have sprung from the despised Maranos. Some historians[1] even go so far as to assert that the entire Spanish nobility is of Jewish origin, and attribute to this fact the extraordinary jealousy they manifest in proving and maintaining the purity of their blood.

In order to understand the motive which prompted the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, an act so irreconcilably inconsistent with the liberal principles that usually guided the government of Ferdinand and Isabella, we must cast a rapid glance at the internal condition of the Spanish Church in that age. Since the time of Gregory IX., and following immediately on the Albigensian persecution, courts of inquiry

[1] *E.g.*, Llorente, Prescott, and Bernaldez.

had been established in many places for the suppression of heresy. In Spain these agencies were directed, for the most part, against the Moors and the Maranos. The latter especially had gradually succeeded in securing some of the highest and most influential offices in the State. In places of trust and emolument about the King's person, men were sometimes found whose relatives had perished in an *auto-da-fè*. The more these New-Christians became merged in the mass of the Church, preserving at the same time their hereditary affection for the Judaistic faith of their ancestors and kinsmen, and transmitting that affection unimpaired to their posterity, the greater became the danger to the purity of the Church's faith in the future. The ecclesiastical leaders became convinced that this covert Judaism, within the bosom of the Church itself, could not be eradicated so long as an open and public observance of Jewish ceremonies was tolerated in the land. Only when the New-Christians were completely cut off from all possibility of intercourse or communion with their former brethren, could a hearty and lasting adhesion to the Christian faith be expected from them. Thus, the fatal error of seeking to retain, by artificial means, a host of unwilling converts within the Christian fold, led to the perpetration of the un-Christian tyranny. Measures which were adopted in the first instance to confirm the New-Christians in the faith, issued finally in the banishment of all Jews from Spain. The fall of Granada and the expulsion of the Moors afforded a fitting opportunity, and suggested the step. The one great non-Christian party in the State being overthrown, the time seemed meet for putting the foot on the neck of the other also.

But the means proved after all to be ineffectual. The persecution that broke out under Philip II. and lasted far into the seventeenth century, is a sufficient proof that Spain did not then succeed in banishing all Jewish and Marano elements from its midst. There still continued to sit in high places men whose Christianity was but an outside garment, and whose hearts still clung to the ancient faith. Our space allows us only to refer to one instance. The learned Isaac Orobio, born of Marano parents, trained in all the philosophy of the age, a skilled leech, and, under the name of Don Balthazar, one of the most distinguished professors of the then

brilliant university of Salamanca, passed for a good Catholic and a most devout son of the Church. An enemy accused him to the Holy Office of practising the rites of Judaism in secret. He was arrested and tried, but there was no definite charge that could be established against him. After three terrible years spent in the dungeons of the Inquisition he managed to escape. He first sought refuge in Toulouse, where he was appointed professor. But not feeling secure in France, he subsequently fled to Holland, and in Amsterdam was received into the communion of the synagogue after publicly renouncing Christianity. In 1637 he published an exceedingly curious work, entitled, "De veritate religionis Judaicæ cum confutatione religionis Christianæ," in which he makes the astounding assertion: "Ideo omnia Monachorum atque monialium Judæarum plena. Canonici, inquisitores, Episcopi plurimi ex Judæis procedunt. Non pauci in corde judaizant et propter ea bona temporalia Christianismum simulant." This extraordinary statement, however, is more than corroborated by a recent writer,[1] who speaks with reference not to the Spain of a past age, but to Spain in our own day. It is worthy of note, in passing, that it was in reply to Orobio's work that Limborch wrote his celebrated and learned treatise, "De veritate religionis Christianæ cum erudito Judæo amica collatio."

We may here bring to a close our sketch of the relation between the Church and the Synagogue in Spain during the Middle Ages. The chapter of Spanish history over which we have been glancing, may be taken as representative of what we should find in the case of every country in Europe. Sadly uniform and consistent is the story of the treatment which Jews have met with on all hands from the nations among whom they were scattered. We may sum up the attitude of Christendom towards Judaism, from the death of Constantine till the Reformation in one word: an unceasing propaganda by means of persecution and violence. The failure of such means to attain the desired end is conspicuous from the fact, that there is not a single instance on record of a thorough and lasting conversion having been brought about by them. In all the cases we have quoted of genuine conversion, the truth of the Gospel was made plain to the Jewish heart either

[1] Borrow: "The Bible in Spain." See especially the author's report of the conversation with Abarbanel.

through independent study of the word of God, or by loving intercourse with true Christians who were after the pattern of Christ.

Our space does not permit us to carry out fully, in the present paper, the purpose with which our article started. But as by far the most interesting page in the history of the diaspora opens with the daybreak of the Reformation over Christian lands, and as the story of Christian love for the house of Israel is too important to be hastily or cursorily dealt with, it may be permitted us to resume our narrative on some future occasion.

JOHN C. MOORE.

---

## ART. III.—*History of the Vatican Council.*

*Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti et Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani, Die* 8 *Decembris* 1869, *a SS. D. N. Pio P. IX. inchoati.* Friburgi Brisgoviæ : 1871.

*Documenta ad Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni* 1870. *Gesammelt und herausgegeben* von Dr JOHANN FRIEDRICH. Nordlingen : 1871.

*Letters from Rome on the Council.* By QUIRINUS. Reprinted from the *Allgemeine Zeitung.* Authorized Translation. London : 1870.

FOR three hundred years after the Council of Trent had closed its sittings in 1564, no ecclesiastical assembly professing to be in any sense œcumenical, met in Christendom. The experience gathered by successive Popes at Constance, at Basle, and even at Trent, did not favour any repetition of the experiment. These great councils had shewn signs of a desire to assert their independence. The members of them had manifested an amount of insubordination, which made it difficult to persuade them to do the exact thing which the papal court expected them to do. Besides, there was some danger of a council putting itself into antagonism to the governments of Europe, and of thus precipitating a conflict, from which the Church was not likely to escape without damage, and which, for that reason, it would be the part of wisdom to postpone and to avoid. For such reasons, it was generally believed that the world would never see another General Council.

Under these circumstances, Christendom was taken somewhat by surprise when, on the 26th of June 1867, Pope Pius IX. announced that it was his design to summon, at an early day, a General Council at Rome, to deliberate on grave and important matters affecting the interests of the Church. Though the Bishops, to whom this intimation was made, professed to receive it with pleasure, some of them, we can well believe, were alarmed at the prospect; and all the more so, that there was nothing, at the time, in the condition of the Church to make it necessary to incur the risk of such a dangerous experiment. But Pius knew well what he was about. He had a grand project before his mind, and to him and his advisers it seemed that the times were ripe for its accomplishment.

Pio Nono, though inferior to many of his predecessors in culture, has never had a superior among them in purity of morals, in suavity of manners, in rigid tenacity of purpose, and in the desire to leave behind him a great and historic name. From the first, he cherished the ambition of doing something which should make his pontificate worthy of being remembered in after ages. The fall of the temporal power—an event, the consummation of which was then imminent—was likely enough to give him the celebrity that he desired; but a man in his position may well be pardoned for wishing to associate his name with something great, but not so calamitous in its nature. His early association with the Liberal party in Italy, from the ruinous consequences of which French intervention alone had saved him; the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith in 1854; and the celebrated Encyclical of December 8, 1864, with its Syllabus of eighty errors placed by him under ecclesiastical ban, might have been sufficient to signalise the pontificate of a man who had sat in the chair of Peter for a longer period of years than any of the 256 men who preceded him in office. But even these were not enough. Two ideas, which had weakened the power of many of his predecessors, and which, if let alone, might be productive of evil at a future day, had yet to be rooted out of the Church. One of these was the notion that a General Council has it in its power to limit the authority, or even reverse the decisions, of a Pope; the other, that bishops have some authority of their own, derived from

Christ through the apostleship, and independent of the chair of Peter. It would, he thought, consolidate the papal power, and smooth the way of all his successors till the end of time, if these two ideas were formally condemned. It might then be affirmed as a Christian dogma, that Church power comes down from Christ through the pope only, and that no bishop has any right or privileges farther than he is pleased to permit; and also, that while councils may and ought to join the successor of Peter in testifying to the truth, it is he alone who is able to testify as to what is the truth without possibility of error. If a general council could be induced to affirm these two propositions,—*that*, of course, was not understood at Rome to be necessary to the truth of the doctrine contained in them, but it would silence objectors. Never again could any man have the face to appeal from the pope to a general council, if a general council itself had abnegated its rights, and had acknowledged the pope to be the only source of power in the visible Church. Were it to do so, Gallicanism would receive its deathblow and trouble Christendom no more. Ever after, the personal declaration of the vicar of Christ would end all controversy. In presence of the condemnation of the ONE INFALLIBLE MAN, Rationalism would not venture to speak, Communism would not lift its head, and Protestantism itself would wither and die. Results so beneficial seemed deserving of a vigorous effort in order to attain them, and could not fail to make illustrious the pontificate in which they were secured.

Moreover, Pio had good reason for believing that the means by which he hoped to reach these results were not impracticable, or even difficult. No previous pontiff, as he well knew, was more popular with the clergy. As misfortunes, arising from his relations with the Italian government, and from the loss of most of his territorial dominions, descended upon him in a series of successive strokes, the Catholic bishops made his sufferings their own, and gathered around the throne of their chief with the greater love and veneration. Besides, the eternal city, under protection of French troops, was still subject to his rule; but it was uncertain how long, in the casualties of political action, the little strip of territory which he governed might enjoy immunity from invasion. Above all, the Jesuits were in favour of the movement. However

ambitious of power that aspiring order might be, it could not object to see the pope absolute ruler of the Church, so long as it remained, what it has been for some time, absolute ruler of the pope. Nor was it likely that the Catholic governments of Europe would throw any serious difficulty in the way; most of them had stood aside, and looked quietly on, to see the vicar of Christ despoiled of most of his possessions, and all of them were shy in cultivating the friendly alliance which had existed between them and Rome in former ages. They could scarcely complain now if the Church took them at their word, and pursued its own way, without asking either their co-operation or advice. Ancient Rome, when the sceptre of dominion over the nations dropped from her hands, seized the sceptre of dominion over human souls, and long held undisputed sway alike over their faith and their life. Now that the vicar of Christ was being despoiled of his territories by sacrilegious force, and that enemies were rejoicing over the approaching overthrow of his temporal jurisdiction, would it not be a grand and masterly stroke to take up a new position, which should enable him to claim the sovereignty, not of one poor little province in central Italy, but of all Christian governments, and, with the concurrence of all Catholic bishops, to have himself acknowledged the one infallible monarch upon earth?

There is now little doubt that thoughts like these were in the mind of the pontiff, when, on the 29th of June 1868, he issued a bull, convoking a general council to meet at Rome on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception in the following year, the 8th of December 1869, for the purpose of providing a remedy for the existing evils by which society was afflicted. In this bull, however, he gave no hint of the one grand remedy which there is reason to think had already been resolved upon at the Vatican. That was to appear in due time.

In the interval, nothing was left undone to impress the whole Christian world with the importance of the event which was about to take place. Invitations were addressed to the prelates of the Greek Church, and of the Nestorian and Monophysite Churches of the East, not in communion with the Apostolic See, urging them on this occasion to unite with their Latin brethren, and to renew the bonds of ancient brotherhood. The Anglican bishops being judged heretical,

were of course ignored; but, on the 13th September 1868, an appeal from Rome was addressed to Protestants and to other non-Catholics, reminding them of the marks of the one true Church, calling their attention to the injuries inflicted on society by their sects and divisions, and urging them to take the opportunity afforded by the Council to be reconciled to the Church from which their ancestors had departed. This was followed up by an apostolic letter, dated 11th of April 1869, promising full remission of sins to all who, between the 1st of June following and the day fixed for the meeting of the Council, should visit their parish churches on two separate occasions, and there pray devoutly for the conversion of the erring, for the spread of the holy faith, and for the triumph and peace of the Catholic Church. The faithful over Christendom rushed to the altar, and took advantage of the very easy terms on which pardon was offered. The Protestants almost everywhere responded to the appeal made to them to re-enter the Church, with significant silence. But the oriental prelates, representing a numerical aggregate of some seventy or eighty millions of professing Christians not in communion with Rome, were more emphatic in their refusal to accept the papal invitation.

The Patriarch of Constantinople receives the spiritual homage of some eighty archbishops and one hundred and seventy bishops. Upon this great ecclesiastic, the pope's legate, having previously given notice of his intention, waited at the time appointed, for the purpose of presenting him with a splendidly bound copy of the pope's Encyclical. The patriarch did not take the document into his hand, but by a peculiar movement signified his wish that it should be laid upon the divan. The legate then made a short statement explanatory of the object of the council. The reply of the patriarch in substance was: "It is useless I should go to a council, in which a discussion so often fruitlessly undertaken before, can only divide men's minds still further: the Oriental Church will never abandon the doctrine that it has received from the apostles, and which has been handed down by the holy fathers and general councils." At the close of this speech, the successor of Chrysostom and Photius beckoned with his hand, whereupon his secretary took up the Encyclical, which all this time the patriarch did not deign to read or even

to touch, and replaced it in the hands of the legate, remarking to him, as he did so, that "the Greek Church would never recognise the pope's infallibility, nor the domination that he assumed over general councils, nor the monarchy that he exercised over the Church." The answer of the other great oriental prelates was to the same effect. In a word, the one hundred and fifty millions of Greek and Protestant Christians refused to participate in any way whatever; so that instead of being Œcumenical, in the true sense of the word, the council came to be, what, from the first, Pius knew well it would be, representative of the Latin Church alone.

Meanwhile, preparations were going forward at Rome, with the view that, when the prelates should assemble, they would have little to do except to ratify the proposals submitted to them. The subject of infallibility had not been mooted in the original bull of convocation, and as if to turn the minds of the bishops in another direction, so early as the 6th of June 1867, a circular was sent them, embodying seventeen questions on points of discipline, and requesting an answer. Six special commissions, consisting mostly of Roman canonists, each presided over by a cardinal, and each with a distinct class of subjects entrusted to it, were appointed to sit and arrange material for the meeting. The pope himself decreed that the council should hold its solemn sessions in the basilica of St Peter's; that all the deliberations should be conducted in Latin, the official language of the Church; and that all the members should sit in the order of their rank. All the officials, the presidents and secretaries, were to be named by the pope. It was arranged that four "congregations" or commissions—one on doctrine, one on discipline, one on oriental rites, and one on monastic matters—should be appointed by ballot in the council; that they should sit permanently; and that these congregations—each consisting of twenty-four members, presided over by a cardinal—on the basis of the rough drafts drawn up by the commissions appointed by the pope, should prepare the decrees. These proposed decrees, having been printed, were to be distributed to the members of council, and then on an appointed day they were to come up before the "general congregation;" that is, before the whole council, in secret session, for consideration and discussion. Members wishing to address the general congregation were to send in

their names a day previously, in order that each might have an opportunity to speak in the order of his rank, but before the close of the sittings it was found necessary to modify this arrangement. In case there was no difference of opinion in the general congregation, the vote was to be taken at once; but in case of a serious difference, the proposed decrees were to be sent back for revision, and brought again before the general congregation at a future meeting. When a public, or, as it was called, a *solemn* session of the council was held, it was held simply for the public adoption of the decrees already adopted in private session; no speeches were then allowed; and no man then had the power of saying more than *Placet*, or *Non-placet*, to the proposal. The public vote having been taken, the pope, who at the solemn session was to preside in person, would announce the result, and decree accordingly. No member was at his own option to submit a proposal even to the general congregation. It had first to be submitted to a congregation of cardinals, and afterwards to the pope, that they might decide whether the subject was suitable for consideration. It was in the special congregations that the real business of the council was transacted, as it was in the general congregation that the discussions were to be held; but in both everything was to be done in secret, and the outside world was to see and know nothing except what transpired at the solemn sessions. Upon trial, however, it was found that seven hundred men could not keep a secret, and each day's proceedings in the general congregation made their way out of doors, and in substance were reported in the papers at Rome, Paris, and Berlin. No member of the council was to depart from the city without permission—an order which, as Pius was still sovereign ruler of Rome, it was easy for him to enforce; and lest his sudden demise should tempt the prelates to do something not set down in the programme, a special bull was issued, enacting, that in case the pope should die while the council was in session, it must immediately dissolve. Every precaution was thus taken that the council should do exactly what the pope wished, and that, in case of refusing so to do, it should do nothing.

As the time appointed for the meeting drew near, the more intelligent Greek and Protestant Christians regarded the affair with some curiosity, as a modern reproduction of those great

ecclesiastical gatherings, which in ancient and mediæval times had exercised a marked influence on the current theology—a link in the chain of great events, whose rapid unrolling is one of the characteristics of our age. But the more intelligent Catholics viewed the matter with more than a historical interest; in them it awoke anxiety and alarm. Though none outside the papal court knew of a certainty why the council was called, they, by a kind of instinct, subsequently justified by facts, suspected that its object was to coin a new dogma, and add it to the current list of Catholic doctrines. In the more enlightened circles of France and Germany, it was believed that the real design of the meeting of the council was to affirm the personal infallibility of the pope, and all who were sufficiently informed to know the consequences involved in such an article of faith, trembled at the prospect which it opened in the distance. In their anxiety to allay this alarm, the German bishops assembled at Fulda three months before the meeting of the council, and issued a pastoral in which they stated that a general council can establish no new dogmas, nor indeed any others than those already written on Catholic hearts; that the only dogma it could affirm is one contained already in Holy Scripture or apostolic tradition, and that its purpose was to set the original truth in clearer light. The design of this manifesto was to remove the popular fears in regard to the infallibility; and yet the studied vagueness with which the prelates express themselves, betrayed a feeling on their part—a possibility, that the popular fears might after all be realised, and seemed to provide for themselves a line of retreat, of which they could take advantage in case of necessity. Well meant as this manifesto was, it was viewed with dissatisfaction at Rome: and when they followed up their action by forwarding to the court a joint letter in which all, except three, remonstrated against the definition of the dogma as inopportune, it is said that the Holy Father was astonished at the presumption of these German bishops in no common degree.

The council when it assembled proved to be a General Council of the Roman Catholic Church, in the very narrowest sense. It contained no representative of the hundred and fifty millions of Christians comprised in the Oriental and Protestant Churches; it did not include an envoy from any of the Catholic governments of Europe. Even France, the eldest

son of the Church, which so long had lent its soldiers to guard the pope in his chair, was not permitted to send an ambassador to the meeting. "Were the privilege granted to France," said Antonelli, "it could not be refused to the other powers." France, therefore, had to be shut out, lest if the door was opened, Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, might venture to step in. This one fact shews clearly the altered position of affairs since the Council of Trent met in 1545, and how much the attitude about to be assumed by the Church was at variance with the principles of modern society.

It is also worthy of remark, that the prelates who sat in council did not represent the laity of the Church in proportion to their numbers and importance. Had all entitled to sit in a general council of the Romish Church been present, it would have consisted of 1049 members; but age, illness, and other reasons, made this impossible; as it was, there met in council 51 cardinals, 10 patriarchs, 9 primates, 115 archbishops, 480 bishops, 22 abbots, and 25 generals and vicar-generals of monastic orders—in all 712. Of these 10 belonged to Australia, 7 to Africa, 76 to America, 84 to Asia, and 535 to Europe. Of the 535 European members, Italy alone supplied 276, all the other countries of Europe united only 259. Twelve millions of German Catholics were represented in the council by 14 votes; the States of the Church, with a population less than one million, were represented by no fewer than 62. There were 120 archbishops and bishops *in partibus*, that is titular bishops who had no dioceses; while Paris, with its two millions of Catholics, and Cologne with a million and a half, were represented each by one archbishop. Notwithstanding these anomalies, perhaps the Church was never so widely represented in any previous council. Every country in the world where Catholicism has found a home, sent somebody to speak in its name. From Pagan lands, there were present missionary bishops, Malay, Chinese, Negro, and Hottentot. From the distant cities of the East, there had come bishops of small communities which professed allegiance to the Roman See. America for the first time appeared by its representatives in one of the great Christian councils. The leading capitals of Europe were represented each by one of its most dignified ecclesiastics. Under the dome of St Peter's, there assembled the representative pastors of one hundred and eighty millions

of human souls. No other man on earth than Pio Nono could have assembled at his call such a grand array out of so many and so distant nations.

December 8, 1869, proved to be a dark and dismal day; but the downpour of rain did not damp the spirit of the prelates, and the council met amid the ringing of bells and the thunder of cannon, which from their iron throats gave the strangers a noisy welcome. The pope in person took the chair, and after the usual religious formalities, delivered an address, in which he spoke of dangers surrounding the Church, said that he had called them together to aid him by their advice, and closed by imploring on their behalf the guidance and protection of the Holy Spirit, of the Queen of Heaven, of the angels and archangels, of Peter and Paul.

The council had no sooner met, than it was discovered that the arrangements made for conducting business were anything but favourable to free and serious deliberation. The Basilica of St Peter's was constructed for grand ceremonials exhibited to the eye, not for intellectual appeals addressed through the ear to the understanding; voices lost themselves in the vast void which intervened between the floor and the roof; it required an effort to hear anything, and it was not till near the final close of the sittings, that the difficulties so long complained of were to some extent diminished by means of a mechanical contrivance which served as a sounding-board. The effect of requiring all the speeches to be in Latin was, that many from want of practice in Latin composition were precluded from addressing the council; those who spoke, usually read speeches that were previously prepared; and the few who were able to make themselves heard were not very well understood, whether from peculiarities of national pronunciation, or from the rapid utterance of a language which they were not accustomed to use as an instrument of thought. Reply and rejoinder, strictly speaking, there was none; for if a man or his published sentiments were directly assailed in the general congregation, he could not respond till his turn came to speak, which might not be for some weeks after, when the whole matter was but dimly remembered; or if he had already spoken, he must allow the attack to pass in silence, inasmuch as it was not permitted to the same man to speak twice in the same debate. Should a speaker occasionally drop a remark displeasing to the curia,

that is, to the cardinals and immediate advisers of His Holiness, or object to the concentration of unlimited power in the hands of one man, he was significantly reminded that he had sworn at his consecration not only to maintain but to increase the rights of the popedom. Reporters from the public press were strictly excluded, and although stenographic writers were employed to take down what was said, members were not permitted afterwards to examine even their own speeches, or to correct any inaccuracy which might have crept into the report. Prelates, not serving on any of the special congregations, were not allowed to hold any external meeting for deliberation in common, nor to print anything till it had passed the censorship, nor to originate any action whatever; the only privilege afforded them, was the right of speaking in the general congregation, and of saying *Placet* or *Non-placet* in the solemn session. Even in the general congregation the right of speech was not beyond interference; an unpalatable address was usually shortened by the vigorous ringing of the bell of the presiding legate, or interrupted by the prelates scraping their feet along the floor. The ballot for the special congregations, which shaped the decrees and in fact transacted all the real business, was so adroitly managed, that no bishop, known to be opposed to infallibility, was by any chance elected to serve upon any of them; and it is not difficult in these circumstances to imagine how suggestions, handed in by the minority to commissions composed exclusively of opponents, would be received. Anything written by the minority, with the view of explaining or defending their opinions, had to be printed at Naples or Florence; but those in favour of the infallibility, were quite free to have printed at Rome anything which they required. It was evident that the council had assembled, not so much to deliberate and to do what on the whole seemed best for the good of the Church, as to receive the commands of the Holy Father, and to give expression to his mind rather than its own.

Though the great object of the council was kept a strict secret in official circles, every man came to Rome with the presentiment upon his mind that it was convened to decree the infallibility, and the members were classed with the majority or the minority according as they favoured or opposed the dogma. The majority, supposed to number 500 at least,

consisted mostly of Italians, and of titular prelates without sees and without people, the latter of whom were lodged and boarded in Rome at the pope's expense, and, as a matter of course, were hot for infallibility. The minority, supposed to be unfriendly to the dogma, were mostly Hungarian, German, French, and American prelates—men whose theological culture had been derived from something more liberalising than the study of the canon law. But the influence of the minority was weakened by a division in their own ranks,—some of them opposing the dogma on the ground that it was in direct contradiction to historical fact, others on the lower ground that it was inopportune to proclaim it in present circumstances. The manifest policy of the curia was first to feel its way and test the actual strength of the minority, and then, after this was ascertained, to use every possible means to break the opposition down, so as to produce virtual unanimity at last. In this the court was only too successful.

So soon as the special congregations were appointed, they set to work, and drew up *schemata*, that is, rough drafts of decrees, which it was hoped the general congregation would with slight change, adopt, and the council, in solemn session, affirm. These *schemata* were each a little treatise on a particular subject, divided into chapters and sections, as if the design had been that the council at its close should issue a complete code of theology and discipline. Each *schema* was intended to be a complete official deliverance upon its own subject. Fifty-one of these *schemata*, it was understood, were to be submitted to the council,—namely, three on the subject of faith; twenty-eight on discipline; eighteen on religious orders; and two on oriental church affairs. But the progress of business was so much slower than had been anticipated, that on the 8th of March, three months after the council met, not one of the *schemata* had been finally adopted; only five of them had been discussed in the general congregation; twelve were then in the hands of members; and thirty-nine had not as yet emerged from the special commission to be distributed among the bishops for consideration. At this rate of progress years must have elapsed before the council could get through the work which its conductors had carved out for it. It was not destined to sit so long; and yet it did not separate till it had performed the main duty for which it was convened.

The first SCHEMA laid before the general congregation was that ON FAITH, which came up so early as the 28th of December. Originally it had consisted of eighteen chapters, but when it had passed the ordeal of discussion in the general congregation, it was reduced to very modest dimensions indeed. The first solemn session of the council was fixed for the 6th of January, in the hope that before that time it would be ready for being publicly affirmed; but the opposition to it was so much greater than had been expected, that when the day arrived there was no decree ready for public ratification, and the fathers, rather than separate without doing anything, repeated publicly the oath which each of them had already taken at the time of his ordination.

The opposition to this *schema* was strong in the general congregation. On the day it was introduced seven prelates spoke against it, and on the 30th of December five others, all of whom objected to it mainly on the ground that it was unsafe for the Church to pledge itself to any narrow definition. It was sent back for revision. On the 16th of March it was again distributed in an amended form, with the view of considering it in the general congregation on the 18th; but so many sent in their names as wishing to speak on the subject, that the design of holding another solemn session on the 25th of March, for its public ratification, had also to be abandoned.

It was in course of a debate on the amended draft, on the 22d of March, that a memorable scene occurred. A Hungarian prelate, Strossmayer, bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium, spoke that day in his turn. Referring to a passage of the *schema*, where the unbelief and rationalism of the present age are said to have had their origin in the Reformation, and in the rejection by Protestants of the decrees of the Council of Trent, he called attention to the well-known historical fact, that in the centuries before the Reformation religious indifference and heresy were common, and that the unbelief, which attained its climax in the French Revolution, had manifested itself, not in a Protestant, but in a Catholic nation: he reminded them of the distinguished services which Protestants, by their able answers to infidel arguments, had rendered to the cause of Christianity in general, and added that all Christians were under obligation to such writers as Leibnitz and Guizot. Each of these state-

ments was received with murmurs, but the murmurs at last rose to a very torrent of indignation. The president, Cardinal De Angelis, cried out most appropriately, considering that the Palace of Inquisition stood at no great distance from the spot where the council was assembled, "This is no place for praising Protestants." Amid the uproar, Strossmayer exclaimed, "That alone can be imposed upon the faithful as a dogma, which has the moral unanimity of the bishops in its favour." The obvious bearing of this general principle upon the doctrine, which, though not yet under discussion, was nevertheless present to every mind, stirred the feelings of the council. Several prelates sprung to their feet, rushed to the tribune, and in wild excitement shook their fists in the speaker's face, exclaiming, "Shame! shame! down with the heretic!" The tumult was awful. The Bishop of Marseilles had the courage to shout amid the din, "I do not condemn him," but his voice was borne down by the response of the majority, "We all, all of us, condemn him." One bishop did not think it beneath his dignity to call the speaker "a damnable heretic." The president, who kept ringing his bell throughout the commotion, succeeded at last in quelling the noise, and informed Strossmayer that he was out of order; whereupon the speaker descended from the tribune, after having first solemnly protested against the unbecoming treatment that he had received. It was estimated that from two hundred to four hundred bishops took part in this discreditable scene. An American prelate afterwards remarked that he "now knew at least one assembly rougher in its deliberations than the Congress of his own country."

The general debate on the *schema* being concluded, the general congregation proceeded to examine the various chapters in detail. On the 29th of March, the first voting took place, when the preamble was adopted in a modified form; and afterwards daily sessions were held on other parts of the draft. On the third chapter no fewer than 112 amendments were proposed, but the discussion on these was conducted in a much more quiet way than that of the 22d of March. The result of the protracted debate was, that the *schema* as adopted was reduced from eighteen to four chapters, introduced by a preamble, and having appended to them eighteen canons anathematising all contrary opinions. The third solemn

session of the Council was held on the 24th of April, and at this meeting, some five months after the Council opened, the first decrees were passed. Strossmayer and some other bishops stayed away, so that a unanimous vote of the 667 members present on that day was obtained in favour of the "Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith." The form of promulgation ran thus: "Pius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the approval of the sacred council, for perpetual remembrance, declares," and so on. Some took exception to His Holiness assuming to promulgate the decrees in his own name; but it was made a point of honour with the curia that they should be published, not in the name of the council, but in the name of the pope with the council's approbation. It was so done accordingly, and after the decree was pronounced in due form, the pope gave to the assembled fathers the benediction of peace.

The Dogmatic Constitution, thus unanimously adopted as the public expression of the mind of the Roman Catholic Church, traces up the errors of Atheism, Pantheism, Materialism, and Rationalism, at present existing in the world, to the fact that so many rejected the divine authority of the Church as expressed in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and claimed the right of private judgment,—that is, to Protestantism, for though it is not expressly named, *that* is what is meant in reality. It entirely overlooks that Protestantism, as a religious system, has never sanctioned these errors, that few Protestants comparatively have adopted them, and that their ablest antagonists have been always found in the Protestant Churches. The first chapter, treating of the nature of the Divine Being, is unexceptionable; but the second chapter re-affirms the old Romish doctrine that supernatural revelation is contained both in written books and unwritten traditions; that the true sense of Scripture is that which has been held, and is held, by holy Mother Church; and that no one is permitted to interpret Scripture contrary to this sense and to the unanimous consent of the fathers. The third chapter, on Faith, appeals to the Church as herself a witness for her divine mission and an evidence for Christianity, by reason of her "admirable propagation, her eminent holiness, her inexhaustible fecundity, her catholic unity, and her invincible stability;" thus setting forth once more the old and often-

refuted sophism,—that everything true of the universal body of God's saints in the world is true of the Romish Church alone. The fourth chapter, on Faith and Reason, defines "that every assertion contrary to the truth of enlightened faith is utterly false;" forbids Christians to defend, as legitimate conclusions of science, such opinions as are known to be contrary to the teaching of the faith, especially if they have been reprobated by the Church; and affirms, that the meaning of the sacred dogmas, which the Church has once set forth, is to be perpetually retained, and is not to be departed from under the appearance and pretence of more profound intelligence. The canons appended to the Constitution on Faith, pronounce an anathema on all who hold atheistic, materialistic, and pantheistic opinions, or who deny the divine inspiration of the Scriptures and the possibility of miracles, or who assert that the progress of science demands that a sense different from that which the Church has understood shall be given to dogmas taught by the Church; and they end by calling on all to labour in warding off and banishing these errors from Holy Church.

The second SCHEMA presented to the Council, was ON DISCIPLINE; dealing more particularly with the duties of bishops. Its general tendency seemed to be to centralize all Church power in Rome, by curtailing any independent jurisdiction which still remains to the episcopate, and making it helplessly dependent on the popedom. One of its provisions, for example, forbade a prelate to reside temporarily outside the bounds of his diocese, without having first obtained the papal consent, and required the archbishop to report to Rome any bishop who did not comply with this regulation. Another conferred upon the pope the right of bestowing, during the temporary vacancy in a see, any benefices in the bishop's gift; the obvious effect of which would have been to draw place-hunters in crowds to Rome, and, of course, to bring large sums into the papal coffers.

The draft containing these and other proposals, gave rise to a brilliant debate in the general congregation, during the course of which the curia was obliged to listen to some plain home-truths, which it was not very fond of hearing. It commenced on the 14th of January, and was continued at intervals for several weeks after. In the discussion, Darboy, archbishop

of Paris, who afterwards fell a victim to the tyranny of the Commune, remarked that, in considering the subject, they must speak of the rights, no less than of the duties, of bishops; and Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague, did not hesitate to say that the college of cardinals needed reform no less than the episcopal order.

The great speech, however, was that of Strossmayer, on the 25th of January. The substance of his address was, that reform should not commence with the bishops; it should begin with the highest, and end only with the lowest members of the hierarchy. The popedom itself should be no longer a purely Italian institution; for Catholics in every country of the world should be eligible to office. The Roman congregations should no longer be composed exclusively of Italians, and should be open to ecclesiastics from all parts of the Church, so that religious questions, in future, may be viewed in a less narrow and jealous spirit. The college of cardinals should contain a representation of all Catholic countries in proportion to their population and importance. General councils ought to be held more frequently,—say once in every ten years, as recommended by the Council of Constance. In this way, the nations would have presented to them, at frequently recurring intervals, an example of the forbearance, patience, and charity, with which the Church deals with great questions. Provincial synods, also, should have a definite and acknowledged influence over the appointment of bishops. He went on to speak of the centralisation of power at Rome, as stifling the very life of the Church, and asserted that true unity is not reached by a flat uniformity, but by every national section of the Church retaining its own peculiar institutions. He called the canon law, as it now exists, a "Babylonish confusion," made up in the main of unpractical, or corrupt, or spurious canons, and said that the world was looking to the council for a codification of canon law, drawn up, not by Roman canonists, but by learned and practical men from all parts of the Church, and which should be adapted alike to present times and circumstances. In answer to a previous speaker, who had said that the reformation of the college of cardinals might be safely entrusted to their father the pope, Strossmayer now said, that they had also a mother, the Church, whose office was to give them wholesome advice and instruction, to which they ought to attend. His

speech lasted for an hour and a half; and many who heard it said afterwards, that no such eloquence in the Latin tongue had been heard for centuries.

Melchers, archbishop of Cologne, also took part in the discussion. He complained of the concentration of ecclesiastical power at Rome; of the system of dispensations always purchasable there; and of its meddling and troublesome domination. Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans, also spoke of "those courtiers who had never learned to tell the truth to the pope,"—a description which, of course, the curia would understand. But one of the most amusing things was said by a Hungarian bishop, when illustrating the evils arising from the necessity of having to apply to Rome for dispensations. He told of a poor woman who came weeping to her bishop, begging him to save her marriage, and her very existence, by a dispensation. But the bishop could not help her in the way she wished; a dispensation could be granted by the pope only; and from the pope there was not the slightest chance of obtaining it; for, said the speaker significantly, "Mulier non habet pecunias,"—*a woman has no money.* The Court prelates took all this very much amiss, and afterwards said of the poor Hungarian bishop, that "he had made himself very disagreeable with his *mulier non habet pecunias.*"

The council was prorogued before this *schema* on discipline had come forth from the ordeal of discussion and was ripe for passing into a decree. It therefore ranks among the lapsed proposals; though, should the council ever reassemble, it is possible that it may be revived. Meanwhile the discussion upon it is of interest to us, as affording a glimpse of the internal condition and administration of the Romish Church, and as proving that many of its own ablest and most accomplished prelates are anything but satisfied with the existing state of affairs.

There is reason to believe that the original design of the papal court was, that the council should vote the dogma of Infallibility by acclamation. But circumstances did not favour this design. It was discovered at an early part of the proceedings, that there was a small but influential minority opposed to it. From the first, the opposition bishops showed a disposition to speak their minds freely, and at length; so that there was every probability that the sittings would be very

protracted. In the unsettled state of Europe, who could tell what disarrangement might occur to prevent the grand consummation? Some political storm might rise suddenly to disperse the council before it had time to do the main work for which it had been called together. Considerations of this kind led to the SCHEMA ON THE CHURCH being brought forward at an earlier period than was originally proposed. It was printed and put into the hands of members about the 21st of January.

In its original form it was a lengthy document of 213 pages, and was drawn up so skilfully, that the doctrine of the Infallibility, which was not stated but implied throughout, could, by a slight addition, be inserted with ease as the natural conclusion to which the whole led up. Three main ideas ran through it all; *first*, that the pope has an absolute dominion over the whole Church; *second*, that his temporal power as a sovereign prince is one of the doctrines of Christianity; and *third*, that Church and State are inseparable, but only on this condition, that when the two powers come into collision, the Church is always to prevail. To the draft as originally presented, twenty-one canons were attached. On the 6th March, as the court party then more than before were feeling the necessity of coming to the point without delay, the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the pope was added by way of supplement and conclusion. Up till the 25th of that month, criticisms might be sent in and suggestions offered; and, even after that date, the congregation having the *schema* in charge made various alterations, the object being to preserve the dogma, and, consistently with that, to secure for its definition as much unanimity as possible.

For months the Infallibility was the grand subject, to which were directed the thoughts of the leading ecclesiastics of Europe. In the council, prelates opposed to it soon became known; and some of them were plied with arguments and temptations almost irresistible to side with the majority; while others of them, not open to conviction, found to their surprise that no difficulty was thrown in the way of their leaving the city and returning home as soon as they pleased. Out of doors, before and after the council opened, distinguished theologians, such as Newman, Montalembert, Hyacinthe, Gratry, and Döllinger, expressed their mind freely on the

matter; most of them against the definition. When the *schema* was actually tabled in the Council, the Catholic governments of Europe remonstrated against the dogma, more particularly against the application of its principles embodied in the canons attached; but even by them Pius was not to be turned from his purpose; and Cardinal Antonelli assured their representatives, with all due suavity, that his master and himself were concerned only about the theory, and that there was no intention on the pope's part to put the new principles in force.

The debate commenced in the general congregation on the 13th of May. Though all the chapters of the *schema* were before the house, yet the discussion constantly gravitated toward the infallibility, which every one felt to be its heart and soul. It was ominous of a struggle, that upwards of a hundred members sent in their names, as desirous to speak on the subject. Though these were not all heard, yet the great dignitaries of the council at one time or other had full opportunity of giving expression to their sentiments; of whom only a few of the more important can be noted here.

Dr Manning, archbishop of Westminster, asserted that infallibility was already a doctrine of the Church, which could not be denied without proximate heresy; and that the council was then engaged not (as some alleged) in making a new doctrine, but simply in proclaiming a doctrine already in existence. Many would have been prepared to admit that the pope speaking in conjunction with the bishops is infallible; but the great Anglican convert, more Roman than the Romans themselves, was the first to take high ground, and to say out boldly in the council, that the pope is infallible, even independently of the episcopate.

Cardinal Cullen, on the 19th of May, made rather a sharp attack on Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg, author of the celebrated work on the Councils, and the highest living authority in that department of ecclesiastical knowledge. But the speech did not attempt to refute any of Hefele's positions; it was a mere *argumentum ad hominem*, intended to shew that in speaking of Honorius the historian had contradicted himself.

Simor, primate of Hungary, and now (1874) a cardinal, rather surprised his friends by opposing the dogma. He was

succeeded at the tribune by the archbishop of Tuam, Dr Machale, a man of celebrity thirty years before, when O'Connell rather profanely designated him the "lion of the tribe of Judah," but who appeared before the council as a feeble old man. His speech was not very effective, but it served to shew at least, that all Ireland was not in favour of the dogma. Archbishop Darboy followed, repeatedly declaring that a decree not accepted by the whole episcopate could have no binding force.

The discussion was continued for many successive days, the ablest speakers on both sides taking part in it, and the monotony of debate being occasionally relieved by a little of the grotesque and absurd. Pie, bishop of Poictiers, maintained that the pope is infallible, *because* St Peter was crucified with his head downwards. Original as this argument is, it was eclipsed by that of a Sicilian bishop, who said that when St Peter was preaching in Sicily, he told the people about his infallibility; that the inhabitants, having some doubt about it, determined to send a deputation to the Virgin Mary to make inquiries, and that her answer was that she was present when her Son conferred this prerogative on Peter. He added, that the Sicilians ever since have been warm infallibilists, for the answer of the Virgin quite removed all their doubts. If this be true, the Sicilians are certainly very advanced theologians.

Valerga, titular bishop of Jerusalem, was less absurd, but not more convincing. He drew a parallel between the Fallibilists and the Monothelites, and maintained, that, as in the person of Christ a Divine will co-existed with a human will subject to sin, so in the pope personal and official infallibility might co-exist with moral sinfulness. It is not supposed, however, that many felt there was much weight to be attached to this rather far-fetched analogy.

An American prelate, Dr Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, spoke strongly on the other side. He maintained that the voice of Christian antiquity, prior to the forged decretals, is unanimously against the notion, that the pope alone, without the bishops, is infallible. He admitted that no pope could wilfully become heretical, but that did not prove him to be infallible; and, against Manning, he asserted that no man is justified in calling a "proximate heresy," an opinion which the Church has not already condemned; "for," said he, "it is the

duty of each individual to follow, not to anticipate, the Church's sentence." He made matters right, however, with the curia, by saying in conclusion, that he would accept the definition if the Council should proclaim it, for he was convinced that God was among them.

Strossmayer made the most remarkable speech of all. He declared that the Papal infallibility was opposed alike to the constitution of the Church, to the rights of the bishops and councils, and to the immutable rule of faith. In governing the Church, the pope and the bishops possessed authority and rights in common, as is shewn by the history of the councils, which in ancient times pronounced on questions of faith and morals. That such councils met so often, proves that the pope was not then held to be infallible; for had he been so considered then, there was no necessity to call a council—the shortest way would have been to inquire at the oracle which never errs. Were the dogma now to be affirmed, the rights of bishops would be gone; all left them would be a shadow—the mere right of giving their assent. For the making of a dogma, something more than a numerical majority is needed—moral unanimity in the Church is essential. Let the personal infallibility of the pope be affirmed, and then it will be no longer necessary to have what in ancient times was deemed essential to an article of faith—antiquity, universality, and consent. If some were anxious to have the doctrine proclaimed, the greatest enemies of the Church were certainly of the number and desired nothing better; and the decree, as he anticipated, would work great evil, by preventing some from entering the Church, and by driving out others who had already entered. He concluded by expressing the hope that the holy father would imitate Christ and St Peter, by shewing an example of humility, and that he would have the proposal withdrawn.

The speech was moderate in its tone, and the speaker throughout was listened to with great attention. The bishop of Pittsburg was not so fortunate. With the freedom characteristic of his country and of his race, he said that the adherents of the Church in the nation from which he came, knew nothing of the doctrine; and yet they were Catholics in life and practice, not like the Italians who are Catholics only in name. The bell of the president immediately reminded

the honest American, that he was touching on rather dangerous ground.

Senestrey, bishop of Ratisbon, assured the council that all Germany was in favour of infallibility, and that it was simply an invention to say that in that country there were evil-minded persons to call it in question; but he was followed by Dinkel, bishop of Augsburg, who contradicted the statement, and warned the assembly not to be misled by such tricks.

Maret, dean of the Theological Faculty of Paris, and a bishop *in partibus*, was the next speaker. He distinguished between infallibility based on the consent of the bishops, and personal infallibility. He warned the council of the dilemma that lay before it; either the council was about to give the pope an infallibility which he did not possess before, in which case the donor was greater than the receiver, by divine and inalienable right; or else the pope was about to give himself an infallibility which he did not possess before, in which case he exercised the right of changing the constitution of the Church by his own personal power; and if the latter were allowable, he did not see any necessity for summoning the council at all. At this point Cardinal Bilio interrupted the speaker by exclaiming, "You are ignorant of the very rudiments of the faith; it does not belong to the council to judge and to decide, but simply to acknowledge the truth and give its vote, and then to leave the pope to define what he chooses by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Notwithstanding this interruption, Maret was allowed to finish his speech, but at its conclusion it was announced that the debate in the general congregation upon the collective *schema* was now closed, in consequence of a written request to that effect, signed by 150 members, having been received by the presidents.

This was on the 3d of June. The minority made a sort of feeble protest at the unexpected close of the discussion, inasmuch as forty members who wished to speak were thereby deprived of the opportunity; but as nearly eighty speeches had been already delivered for and against the dogma, the prolongation of the debate would have been more likely to waste time than to cast additional light upon the subject. Besides, if anything important yet remained unsaid, it could be produced when the separate chapters of the *schema* came up for discussion *seriatim*. These chapters, after passing through

the fire of discussion in the general congregation, were now reduced to four, with a preamble, the doctrine of the infallibility being inserted in the last chapter. But as this great dogma was the natural completion of the whole *schema*, the debate on the three previous chapters constantly reverted to the infallibility, even before the fourth chapter came to be discussed in its order.

About 120 prelates sent in their names as desirous to speak on the chapters in detail, of whom about fifty enjoyed that privilege. One of the first to revert to the grand subject was the Dominican monk, Guidi, cardinal archbishop of Bologna. He commenced by saying that the personal infallibility of the pope was a doctrine unknown to the Church down till the fourteenth century. Scripture and tradition furnish no proof of it. Was there an instance where the pope, apart from the Church, had ever defined a single dogma? An act might be infallible, but a person never. But every infallible act, he argued, proceeds from the Church herself only: the pope has to examine whether all the churches agree with the Romish Church on the point in question, and then, having ascertained the fact, is to decree accordingly. He shewed from the works of the Jesuits Bellarmine and Perrone, that in defining doctrines the popes never act alone, nor have they acted alone even in condemning heresy. As the speaker proceeded, a prelate, unable to restrain himself when he heard his own opinions called in question, called him "a scoundrel," another called him "a brigand." Guidi conducted himself with great coolness in the face of these salutations, and concluded by proposing that infallibility should be affirmed of the pope, only when he spoke after making full inquiry into the traditions of the Church on the subject, and after obtaining the consent of the bishops to his decree. It is said that the pope afterwards sent for the bold Dominican, and rebuked him sharply for his heresy and ingratitude. It did not escape remark throughout the proceedings of the council, that Pius seemed to regard every man who spoke against his absolute infallibility as a personal opponent of his own.

Dr Leahy, archbishop of Cashel, in Ireland, spoke on the 13th of June. His argument was, that society now needs a deliverer to protect it from the encroachments of Rationalism, the anti-church policy of civil governments, the poisonous

influence of journalism, and the political sects of revolution; that this deliverer, to be of any use, must be omnipotent and infallible, and that the pope is the very man. The bishop of Badajoz, in Spain, with the capacious faith characteristic of his country, asserted that the pope is virtually Christ in the Church—the continuation of the incarnation of the Son of God, and that therefore to the holy father belongs the same power, in extent at least, as belonged to Christ when he was visible on earth.

These sentiments were introduced incidentally in speeches made avowedly on those chapters which preceded the fourth of the *schema*, but at last the fourth chapter, containing the great dogma, came forward for special discussion.

The first speaker upon it was Matthieu, cardinal archbishop of Besancon. His address was mainly a panegyric on his own nation, without whose army, at Civita Vecchia, neither pope nor council, he alleged, could remain at Rome a single day. This line of remark from him was provoked by Valerga, who in a previous speech had reproached the French for their Gallican errors.

Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, then spoke. He shewed that the personal infallibility of the pope was inconsistent alike with the facts of history and the traditions of the Church, and that its affirmation at present was likely to damage the Church seriously in future; and he recommended, that, if now proclaimed, every occasion of its exercise should be made conditional on the consent of the episcopate being previously obtained.

On the 20th of June the subject was resumed. The bishop of Teano, in Italy, charged Guidi, although said Guidi was an Italian and a Dominican and a cardinal, with exceeding the French in his desire to canonise Gallicanism, and maintained that it should be left to the pope to determine in each case how far the Church was to be consulted and the Holy Ghost invoked. Guidi had asserted that the admonition of Christ to Peter to "strengthen his brethren," implied their possession of something which was to be strengthened, and had interpreted it to mean that the pope was to confirm the doctrine which the bishops already held. To this the bishop of Teano now replied, by saying that Guidi's notion was utterly uncatholic; that the initiation of doctrine must come from above, not from

below; that it must originate, not with the bishops, but with the pope, who has it in his power to avail himself of the help of the Holy Ghost.

On the same day Dr Machale again spoke against the infallibility with great severity, and Dr Errington, an English archbishop, who had once acted as coadjutor to Cardinal Wiseman, proposed to express the dogma in an abstract form, but the proposal was not accepted by either side.

Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, then delivered a great and powerful speech. Three times, he said, he had asked for proof from Scripture, from tradition, and from councils, to shew that the bishops of the Church were excluded from the definition of dogma, but hitherto he had asked in vain. Now again he adjured them, like the blind man on the way to Jericho, to give him sight that he might believe. The credibility of Catholic doctrine, as founded on the general consent of the episcopate, had been used by him and others as an argument to draw into the Church those who stood without; but now a magnet, which had so often proved its attractive power, was to be taken from them, and they were told to believe, without proof, that it had always been the creed of the Church that the pope is everything and the bishops nothing. But "we bishops," he continued, "have no right to renounce for ourselves and for our successors the hereditary and original rights of the episcopate, and to give up the promise of Christ, 'I am with you to the end of the world.' But now they want to reduce us to nullities, to tear the noblest jewel from our pontifical breastplate, to deprive us of the highest prerogatives of our office, and to transform the whole Church, and the bishops with it, into a rabble of blind men, among whom is one alone who sees, so that they must shut their eyes and believe what he tells them."

The bold American was followed by a Spanish prelate, the archbishop of Granada. His tone was basely servile to the curia. In the superabundance of his homage he declared that to define infallibility was not enough for him; he wished the council to decree another Christian dogma—the divine and inviolable nature of the pope's temporal power.

From the specimens of individual opinion thus presented, the sources of the weakness of the minority are evident. Hampered by the Romish principle of the authority of the

Church, none of them could build on the great broad fact, that infallibility is devoid of all basis in the Holy Scriptures. Some of them did maintain that it was in direct opposition to historical fact; others, that it was contrary to the traditions of the Church. Some were in favour of a modified infallibility; others did not object to the doctrine, but pled only for delay. The minority was thus divided in its opposition. But the court party, now aware that the majority was on their side, were united and resolute, and pushed forward the matter to the end; and the pope, notwithstanding the increasing heat of the summer, and the fever and disease which it usually brings with it to strangers in the city, announced his intention not to prorogue the Council until the *schema* on the Church was disposed of conclusively. As the debate progressed, every means short of force was employed to detach individuals from the minority, and thus to secure if possible moral unanimity. But as the summer heat increased, and fever became more virulent, and intrigues multiplied, a sense of weariness crept over the Council, and all began to feel the necessity of coming very soon to an end.

On the 23d of June, Landriot, archbishop of Rheims, proposed that the whole subject should be remitted to a commission appointed by the council, with instructions to examine the traditions on the subject, and to report,—a proposal which seemed so fair that it was difficult to resist it, yet as *that* had to be done at all hazards, it was displeasing to the curia. But the placid termination of the speech removed all dissatisfaction, for he stated that if it pleased the pope to affirm the dogma, he submitted already by anticipation.

On the 25th of the same month, Ketteler, bishop of Mayence, alleged that it had not been shewn as yet that any evidence for the personal infallibility of the pope was contained either in Scripture, or in tradition, or in the consciousness of the Church; all in fact that could be said for it, was, that it is the opinion of a certain school. He admitted the right of the pope to condemn doctrines which contradict dogmas already decided by the Church, but could not admit his right to formulate new dogmas, which is an entirely different matter. The deposit of the faith is not entrusted to the pope alone; in every decree Scripture and tradition are to be taken into

account, and the bishops are essential to the pope as representatives and witnesses of tradition.

The answer to this given by an Irish ecclesiastic, Dr Keane, the bishop of Cloyne, was somewhat amusing. He said that the popes were not dependent on the bishops for tradition, because St Peter brought the whole body of tradition with him to Rome,—the pope had charge of the deposit, and could have recourse to it when necessary. To some in the council it seemed rather an original idea that St Peter's portmanteau was stored up somewhere in the Vatican, and that each successive occupant of the chair had only to slip in his hand when there was occasion, and to take out what he wanted.

At the sitting on the 28th of June, Ginoulhiac, bishop of Grenoble, reputed to be, after Maret, the most learned of the French bishops, opposed the dogma, not on the ground that it was false, but that the proclamation of it would be productive of evil, stirring up hostility to the Church in quarters where it did not now exist, and intensifying it where it existed already.

Martin, bishop of Paderborn, created something like a stir in the Council, by delivering, in an elevated tone, bordering on a scream, a speech, in which he asserted that the personal infallibility is inseparable from the primacy; that the pope is the supreme legislator, and it is necessary, therefore, that he should be beyond the danger of falling into an error. And so important did he hold this doctrine to be, that he thought priests, and others having care of souls, should be admonished to impress this doctrine often upon the people from the pulpit.

Verot, bishop of Savannah, in the United States, when answering the common statement which seems to pass for an axiom at Rome,—namely, that historical facts must yield to the certainty of doctrine, threw his judgment into a very emphatic form—"With me, an ounce of historical fact is worth a thousand pounds of your theories."

Little new light was now coming in from either side. On the 4th of July, all who had not yet spoken waived their right, and by mutual consent this remarkable debate ended; remarkable for the length to which it extended, the importance of the subject discussed, the rank and ability of the speakers, and the results certain to arise from the decision pronounced.

The 13th of July was fixed for taking the vote in the

general congregation. On that day there were 91 members of the Council, known to be in Rome at the time, who did not answer to their names. There were, however, 601 members actually present. Of these, 451 voted *Placet;* 62 voted *Placet juxta modum,*—that is, they voted for the dogma conditionally; and 88 voted *Non-placet.* The numerical weight of the minority was thus greater than had been anticipated, when the influences at work to diminish their numbers were considered. Among the 88 who had the courage to appear and oppose the Papal Infallibility by their vote, were included Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna; Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague; Cardinal Matthieu, archbishop of Besancon; Simor, primate of Hungary; Darboy, archbishop of Paris; Genoulhiac, archbishop of Grenoble; Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans; Maret, bishop of Sura and dean of the Sorbonne; Haynald, archbishop of Kalossa; Ketteler, bishop of Mayence; Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg; Strossmayer, bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium; Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, in Nova Scotia; Kenrick, archbishop of St Louis; and Machale, archbishop of Tuam,—men second to none for learning and position in the Roman Catholic Church. The bulk of the majority consisted of Italians and Spaniards, men whose names, if mentioned, could add nothing to the weight of their votes.

Notwithstanding all that had occurred, some hopeful spirits, it would seem, still thought that a private representation to His Holiness might even yet save the ship of the Church from striking on the rocks. No harm could result from making the experiment. An influential deputation from the minority, consisting, among others, of Darboy, Simor, and Ketteler, waited on the pope on the evening of the 15th of July. They earnestly entreated that, for the sake of peace, he would withdraw that portion of the 3d chapter, which, at the expense of the bishops, concentrates all ecclesiastical power in himself, and insert a clause in the 4th chapter limiting his infallibility to such decisions on faith and morals as were arrived at after full inquiry into the traditions of the churches. The deputation were a little taken aback when His Holiness assured them that he had not yet read the *schema,* and did not know what it contained. Had he not positively said so, they could not have believed this possible; but, with admirable presence of

mind, the archbishop of Paris said that the legates were certainly much to blame, who up to this time had kept him uninformed as to the terms of a decree which, as was announced, he was, in three days after, to affirm as true before the Church and the world. But their surprise was still greater when he responded, by saying, that "the *whole* Church had *always* taught the unconditional infallibility of the pope." After that astounding statement, further reasoning, of course, was useless. Unwilling to leave without another effort still, Bishop Ketteler fell upon his knees, and implored him to make some concession for the good of the Church; but, while smooth and polished as marble, Pius was as cold and hard, and the distinguished German asked in vain. For a moment, indeed, the deputies thought that they had made an impression, but an hour after the interview, Manning and Senestrey called, and Pius soon relapsed into that "non possumus" mood which is associated with his name, and which will probably characterise his pontificate to other generations.

Public opposition and private remonstrance had both failed to avert the danger; and now the solemn session was at hand. To the minority it seemed, that to record a public vote against the infallibility could not prevent the definition, while it would exhibit their divisions to the world, and aggravate the evils of the Church. Accordingly, on the 17th, 56 prelates sent in a written protest, in which they informed His Holiness that they were still of the same mind, but that, out of respect to himself, they would not vote against a matter in which he took so deep an interest, and that therefore they should return to their homes. The same evening, nearly 60 others left the city. By their absence from the next day's ceremonial, they refused to grace the triumph of their opponents and avoided the mortification of a public discomfiture. But this was the move which in reality lost the battle. By their voluntary withdrawal from the field, they acknowledged that the victory was with the opposition, they renounced all claims to a drawn battle, and actually produced the moral unanimity, which, they had always said, was essential to a valid decree, and which, if they had remained at their posts, could not have been obtained for the Papal Infallibility.

The 18th of July was the day fixed for the proclamation of the dogma, which, according to the curia, was to consummate

the victory of the Church. On that day the fourth and last solemn session of the council was held. It proved to be a day of darkness and storm, the rain pouring down in torrents, flashes of lightning alternating with peals of thunder, and repeatedly lighting up the dim aisles of St Peter's with their lurid glare. The pope was present in full state, together with the prelates and cardinals of the majority, to the number of 533. The religious service being concluded, the secretary read the dogma, and then the names of the members were called over in succession. Amid the darkness and thunder of that dismal day, all present, to the number of 531, voted *Placet;* 2 only voting *Non-placet,*—namely, Riccio of Cajazzo, in Sicily, and Fitzgerald of Little Rock, in Arkansas, United States; but their opposition must have been the result of no very deep conviction, for before the session was closed, they also had submitted to the decree. After the voting, the result was made known to the pope. Pius then stood up with his golden mitre upon his head, but so thick was the darkness, that an attendant had to bring a lighted candle in order to enable him to read the formula. By its assistance, he was enabled to announce to the Church and to the world, that henceforth a man was clothed with the infallibility of God. The decree thus being ratified, the Ultramontane triumph was secure. Higher than the thunder out of doors was the loud and long-continued roar of applause which rose from the assembled prelates; hundreds of white handkerchiefs were waved over their heads, and shouts of "Viva Pio Nono," "Viva il Papa infallibile," were again and again repeated. The *Te Deum* and the benediction brought this extraordinary scene to a close.

The *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of Christ,* as this decree is called, consists of a preamble and four chapters, each of which closes with an anathema on those who deny the doctrine therein affirmed. The preamble asserts that Christ placed Peter over the other apostles, "that by means of a closely united priesthood the whole multitude of the faithful might be preserved in the unity of the faith and communion." The first chapter affirms that Christ conferred on St Peter "the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God," appointing him "the prince of all the apostles, and the visible head of the whole Church militant." The second

chapter affirms that St Peter has a perpetual line of successors in this primacy over the universal Church, and that whoever succeeds Peter in the Roman see, "by the institution of Christ obtains the primacy of Peter over the whole Church." The third chapter affirms, that by the appointment of Christ the Roman Church has supreme jurisdiction over all other churches; that the jurisdiction of the pontiff is immediate; that to it all, both pastors and the faithful, are bound to submit, not only in matters of faith and morals, but in matters of discipline and government; that, in the exercise of his office, he has the right of freely communicating with all pastors of the Church, and with their flocks, irrespective alike of the will or confirmation of the secular power; that he is the supreme judge of the faithful; and that it is unlawful to appeal from his decisions to an œcumenical council. The fourth chapter declares that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the primacy which the pope enjoys over the whole Church; that he is the father and teacher of all Christians; that the see of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error; and that this gift of truth and never-failing faith was conferred upon Peter and his successors to enable them to perform their high office for the salvation of all. Then follows the decree of Infallibility, in the following words:—

"Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, with the approbation of the sacred council, we teach and define it to be a dogma divinely revealed: That when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*,—that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine regarding faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he enjoys, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine regarding faith or morals; and therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are unalterable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church."

The events which followed the decision were so sudden and stupendous, that they excited the astonishment of Europe. Two days after the proclamation of the dogma, the Emperor Napoleon III., who had for some time felt jealous of the growing influence of North Germany, declared war against

Prussia, and entered on that disastrous campaign which in a few weeks resulted in the loss of his crown and in the humiliation of France. On the 2d of September, Napoleon surrendered at Sedan; the fall of the Imperial Government in France was followed by the proclamation of a republic; the King of Prussia, after his triumph and the capture of Paris, assumed the title Emperor of Germany; and Protestantism, in his person, was elevated to the political and military leadership of Europe. Meanwhile the removal of the French troops, which for years at Civita Vecchia had protected the last remnant of the pope's civil authority, and their return to their own country, left the way open for the important event which occurred in Italy. So soon as it was known that the tide of war was going against France, King Victor Immanuel, who had long been on the watch for an opportunity to occupy the capital of his own kingdom, stepped in without encountering any resistance, and on the 24th of September, amid the welcome and plaudits of the populace, took possession of Rome. With him the Bible entered, and, at the same time, civil liberty and religious toleration, so that now Christian worship is as free in the city of the Cæsars and of the pope as in any city of the world. Since that time Victor Immanuel occupies the Quirinal, and Pio Nono the Vatican; the temporal power, which had been wielded by his predecessors for eleven hundred years, having dropped from the hands of the infallible pope as quietly as a sere leaf from the autumn tree.

The changes which had thus taken place in a few weeks, and the free institutions by which Pius IX. now found himself surrounded, were not favourable to the continuance of the Vatican Council. But the declaration of infallibility, the real work for which it had been convened, was accomplished. Notwithstanding, it existed formally till the 20th of October; then it was adjourned till the 20th of November; and then it was prorogued *sine die*. Should it ever assemble again, it will be under very different conditions from those which surrounded it on the 8th of December 1869. But why should it meet? An infallible pope has all within himself; he can never need a council any more.

What has been the action of the minority since the council was closed? The answer which we have to give to this question is the most humiliating fact of all. Their conduct

has been apparently that of men who either had no deep convictions of truth, or no strength to make the sacrifices which deep convictions demand. All the opposing bishops have, we believe, submitted to the decree, and have accepted as true what they declared to be opposed to Scripture, to tradition, and to history. Rauscher of Vienna published the decree in August 1870; Schwarzenberg of Prague hesitated till January 11, 1871; and Hefele waited till the 10th of April, saying, as he yielded, "The peace and unity of the church is so great a good, that great and heavy sacrifices may be made for it." Maret, the dean of the Sorbonne, has withdrawn from sale his writings against infallibility, adding that he "wholly rejects everything in his work which is opposed to the dogma of the council." Even the gifted and learned Strossmayer is dumb, and has, we fear, followed the example of his brethren. After fighting in the council the battle of truth with such ability and persistence, their defection is disappointing, and demonstrates but too forcibly how immeasurably, in faith and courage, these men fall short of the men of the Reformation age. No effort of imagination enables us to think that the same silence and submission found in Rauscher, and Hefele, and Maret, when the interests of truth and conscience were at stake, could by any possibility have been shewn, under similar conditions, by Martin Luther or Philip Melancthon, by John Calvin or John Knox.

The full effects of the Vatican council it will require centuries to work out. Meanwhile this much is evident, that it has given the last and finishing blow to Gallicanism, for now a general council has condemned that old theory, has actually signed away its own rights and privileges, and has affirmed that henceforth no appeal lies to any council whatever after the decision of the pope has been pronounced. It has destroyed the independence of the Catholic bishops; they can no longer claim to derive their authority directly from Christ and the apostles; they derive it from the pope, and henceforth they can originate no action and exercise no jurisdiction except by his permission and authority. It has made the pope the absolute ruler of the church, no longer bound to consult farther than he chooses the voice of the bishops or the tradition of the churches. Everywhere over the world it has made such a thing as liberal Catholicism impossible; he who henceforth

attempts to reconcile the Romish Church and modern civilisation, by the very act publicly fixes the stigma of heresy on himself. It has created a new Article of Faith, unknown to the Scriptures or the primitive ages, and which no Roman Catholic was bound to believe up till the 18th of July 1870. He who refuses to believe it now, incurs the sin and penalty of heresy.

From a papal point of view, these results may be counted advantages rather than disasters; but even Roman Catholics can scarcely see the benefit of the new secession from the Church which has taken place on the Continent, of the loss to their body of such men as Döllinger, Friedrich, Hyacinthe, and Reinkens, or of the collision with the civil power which the decree has precipitated in Germany and Switzerland. This is the beginning; who can tell the end? Even at present it is easy to see that a new and perennial element of strife has been wantonly cast into the political and ecclesiastical relations of Europe; and it is certain that historians, in coming time, will regard the Vatican council of 1869 as an era from which Latin Christianity entered on a novel and most interesting part of its career, and commenced to develop tendencies, the results of which will be fresh starting-points in the story of man.

THOMAS WITHEROW.

---

## ART. IV.—*The Sermons of Richard Hooker.*

*Keble's Edition of Hooker's Works.* Three Volumes. 1865.

IN a previous paper,[1] a sketch was given of the life and character of this eminent person. In the present, it is proposed to give an account of some of his writings.

"Hooker," says Mr Hunt, in his summary of "Religious Thought in England," "is on all sides admitted to have been the greatest intellect that had yet appeared in the Reformed Church of England, and all parties agree to receive him as the wisest exponent of her doctrine, and the truest incarnation of her spirit. Therefore it is that every party claims Hooker as

[1] *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for July 1873.

on their side." There is much truth in this statement, although to one who knows anything of the history of the Church of England, the latter part of it must sound very strange. In the whole fifty-five volumes of the Parker Society—extending from Cranmer to Rogers, and including Jewel—there is no writer who can compare with Hooker in the combination of intellectual force with the charms of refined art, imaginative light and warmth, and philosophic insight and elevation. But what is the "doctrine and spirit" of the Church of England? and how could this be embodied in one man? Whatever it may be, Mr Hunt seems to tell us that it is something contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles. For, after two or three pages, in which he touches some salient points of Hooker's doctrine, he proceeds to describe the famous "Christian Letter," in which Hooker was challenged as contradicting the Articles, and implies that this charge was not made without foundation. "The writers collected a series of passages out of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' and placed alongside of them passages from the Articles, where not only the tone and spirit, but the very words, appeared to differ." He is careful to remind us with regard to this attack, that "it was said that Hooker was so sensible of its force that it hastened his death." And he goes on to give *seriatim* the passages referred to, and the Articles with which they are supposed to conflict. It is difficult to see how this can be reconciled with the previous description of Hooker. It is true that Mr Hunt, though often admirably clear and searching, is also not seldom loose and superficial in his statements, and is always apt to be misled by his dislike of any dogmatic assertion of Christian belief. But the mystery lies much deeper.

There has all along been a singular mixture or confusion of doctrinal belief and religious sentiment in the Church of England, and a succession of rapid and decisive changes in the prevailing type. It has been strikingly said that—

"A period of about seventy years, or two generations, seems generally sufficient to complete a thorough and entire change in the prevailing system of theology; that in 1560, under Archbishop Parker, the Church of England was Calvinistic and thoroughly Protestant; . . . that in 1630, seventy years after, under Archbishop Laud, the same Church had become Arminian, and scarcely, or very faintly, Protestant;" and that

if we "once more pass over seventy years, and come down to the year 1700, a third and totally different school from either of the former meets our view, for the Tillotsons and Burnets are neither of the school of Parker, nor yet do they resemble Laud."

The remark admits of extension to our own times. In 1770 religion and even moral principle seemed to have died; in 1840 we have the "Tracts for the Times," and a few years later the "Essays and Reviews."[1] The peculiarity of our time is, that the three schools, so widely divergent from each other, are seen co-existing, and in such proportions, and with such internal vigour, that in literature and in the courts of law they maintain a deadly and uncertain strife. How it came about that the Church of England should wear a coat of so many colours; from what radical flaws in its system, and from what unhappy occurrences in its early history,—for it is there they are to be sought for, no substantial change in its constitution having taken place since the time of Elizabeth,—there has resulted so much instability, we shall not now particularly inquire. For the present, we shall only name what we believe to have been the leading elements:—First, the complete subjection of the Church to the civil power,—a subjection unparalelled among the Reformed Churches; which was at first tamely submitted to, then boasted of, and even made an article of faith, and which tended directly to foster a worldly and latitudinarian spirit. Second, the compromising relations set up towards the Church of Rome, in formularies, usages, and policy, tending to breed a Romanism wanting only in the possession of a pope. Third, the doubtful relations observed towards the Word of God, appearing in the constant appeals to the fathers of the first five or six centuries, and in the open disregard of Scriptural example in the framing of the Church polity. And last, the episcopal system, which naturally nourishes in church rulers a love of pomp and power, to the ruin of godly discipline, to the lowering of the dignity of freedom, and to the hindering and discouraging of the activity of individual Christian life. But our immediate concern is not with the system itself or its history. The question before us is, How could it be said, with any truth, that the doctrine and spirit of a church so divided, and so fluctuating in its radical beliefs and spiritual tendencies, are represented systematically

[1] See Dr James Buchanan's "Lectures on Justification," pp. 217, 218.

in the teaching of any one man? And yet, in no inconsiderable measure, the statement is correct. In the words of Dean Stanley (for once giving a tolerably accurate portrait)—

"By a strange, almost unique, combination, he (Hooker) united in himself, as no other English divine before or since, the main features of the personal theology of Luther, as exhibited in his sermons; the passion for ancient creed and ritual, as seen in the fifth book of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity;' with the broad and deep principles of philosophic freedom and spiritual religion which pervade the general framework, and animate the substance of his great work."[1]

But this only breeds fresh inquiries. By what singular conjunction of circumstances the task of harmonising such varied and conflicting elements could have been imposed on one man; by what singular freak of nature any one man, accepting this task, could have been fitted for accomplishing it with so fair a measure of success, that, instead of being treated as a lunatic, he is regarded with a pre-eminent admiration and reverence, and his support eagerly claimed by every sort of partizan; by what methods this has been achieved; and finally, how far he has really succeeded in his attempt:—such are the questions which meet the student of Hooker.

It is curious to observe how such questions were entirely ignored in the earlier half of this century. This came out very clearly in the Gorham controversy. Bishop Philpott and Mr Maskell thought they had a sure card in Hooker. Dean Goode, on the other hand, by quoting some strong passages, and emphasising, by means of great capital letters and other small arts of printing in which he delighted, those saving clauses and words by which Hooker cemented the diverse parts of his mosaic, made out a plausible case for the Evangelicals. But the case was different in Hooker's own time. Whitgift had considerable difficulty in saving the orthodoxy of his favourite *protegé;* and the truth is, that it was Hooker who gave the first occasion for the rise of Doctrinal Puritanism. The "Christian Letter," in which the "Ecclesiastical Polity" was attacked, was the first Puritan publication in which the question of doctrine was raised. Previously it had only been the framework of offices and rites and the Prayer Book which were challenged. But Hooker was regarded as having, in defence of these, seriously undermined the Articles of Religion;

[1] Sermon on Hooker in *Good Words*, January 1873.

and thenceforward the controversy took its broader shape, and became more vital. Mr Keble, from his intimate acquaintance with Hooker, is much more discriminating than the Tractarians came to be, when they plied their drag-net to make a general haul of all sorts of authorities. His strong bias sways him aside, but, on the whole, he is not unjust in conceiving of Hooker as originating a new school of thought, and designing "*serere arbores quæ alteri sæculo prosint.*" Only his view is too narrow. It was not one school, but many, that Hooker intended to found or to cherish. He wrote for the statesman and the philosopher, as well as for the ecclesiastic and the divine. He had a prevision of the whole *desiderata* for the maintenance and defence of the Church of England as it stood by law, or was exhibited in its existing usages and formularies; and he sought underground, in his stores of philosophical and patristic lore, for principles, or seeming principles, of truth or authority, on which the whole vast and discordant fabric might rest.

The "Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity" was the ripe fruit of this great design. It was this work alone which he himself published and by which he meant to live. There is no reason to believe that he intended to publish any other of the writings that have come down to us with his name, unless it were certain fragments which might have grown, had he lived, into a reply to the "Christian Letter." But his Opuscula, consisting of a few sermons with his short Answer to Travers, are not only valuable in themselves, but also peculiarly interesting as furnishing a clue to the development of his views and ways of thinking, from the time when, as the pupil and friend of Reynolds at Oxford, he was probably a moderate Puritan, to the time when, after his sharp controversy with Travers at the Temple, and under the auspices of Whitgift, he began to fashion his great work, by which it was hoped that all Puritan ideas might be banished for ever from the minds of men of every class. Nearly all his writings are controversial, both in origin and substance; even the most notable of the sermons are of this character. The polemical element entered at least as largely as any other into his mental and moral structure; and, indeed, from his very first entrance upon public life to his latest day, he lived in the atmosphere of disputation.

I. It is much to be regretted that of the sermon which Hooker preached at St Paul's Cross, when he first came into public view, we have no record besides Walton's report, and some indefinite references in the papers of the Temple quarrel. What Hooker really taught in this sermon, is a very interesting matter; for it opens up the whole question of his Calvinism. According to Walton, the language which he employed is sufficiently Arminian in sound; and Mr Keble, in his desire to shew that Hooker departed widely from what he calls the extreme Calvinism then prevailing, tries to connect this sermon with a movement that arose in Cambridge a few years later, and may be regarded as the first decisive step towards the coming prevalence of Arminianism in the time of Laud. Strype, in his "Life of Whitgift," gives a minute account of this movement. It took shape in the proceedings against Barrett, a fellow, and Baro, a professor of divinity. The result was, that Barrett had to make repeated retractations, and Baro to resign his office; and it was with a view to put an end to the whole movement that the Lambeth Articles were framed. It is unlikely that Hooker had anything to do with this affair. His sermon was preached ten years before, and he belonged to a different university. It is true, however, that the sermon caused a good deal of discussion at the time, and some suspicion continued to hang about his reputation as a divine. One of Travers' charges against him implies that he had used some dangerous methods of representation on the subject of predestination; and he says that he had thought it necessary to correct the error in his own preaching and to confer with Hooker privately with regard to it. The only account, however, which he gives of the teaching in question, is that "it was not unlike that wherewith Corrano sometime troubled this Church." Of this Corrano we have some faint traces in the correspondence of Grindal and Parker, published by the Parker Society, from which we learn that Corrano, a few years before, had occupied the position of reader of divinity in the Temple, from which he had been dismissed for erroneous teaching about free grace and predestination. His errors could not have been very grave, since we find him presently after appointed to a similar readership at Oxford, and he ended his days as a prebendary of St Paul's. Hooker, too, in his answer to Travers, which was addressed to Whitgift, a

most watchful defender of Calvinism, does not shrink from the doctrine of his sermon, but, on the contrary, claims the approval of the Bishop of London, who had been present when it was delivered. It is noticeable, indeed, that he takes care to avoid going into particulars, so as not to breed further discussion of the statements he had used; but that he had made any serious deflection from Calvinistic doctrine is hardly conceivable. Augustine, Jewel, and Calvin, are the divines whom he most highly lauds; and his affirmations of the particular election of the saved, of the efficacy of divine grace, and of the certain perseverance of the saints, in several parts of his writings, are beyond question.

Walton's account of this sermon is, that Hooker taught as follows: "That in God there are two wills, an antecedent and a consequent will: His first will, that all mankind should be saved; but His consequent will, that those only should be saved that did live answerable to that degree of grace which He had offered or afforded them." There is a considerable resemblance in these statements to some of Baro's. But Baro went further; and Dean Goode gives him up as substantially Arminian. Turretine gives the history of this distinction of the antecedent and consequent will, and a critical estimate of its use. He places it "among those which are less convenient, and have something unsound in them, and are therefore deservedly rejected." It was first introduced by John Damascene, the principal divine of the Greek Church, and upholder of its semipelagianism, in the seventh century, and was afterwards greedily laid hold of by the schoolmen and all the patrons of universal grace. But some Calvinists have thought it capable of being retained, and soundly applied in two ways. First, with regard to the revealed will of God for human guidance, we may speak of an antecedent will as appearing in the commands, and of a consequent will as declared in the promises and threatenings which are added to the commands by way of sanction, and the benefits or punishments which follow upon man's obedience or resistance. Second, with regard to the divine decrees, as to their order and our manner of conceiving of them, the distinction may be legitimately used; so that we may say, for example, that the decree of the creation of man precedes the decree of his redemption. The anti-Calvinistic use is to take the antecedent will as the design

of God for the salvation of all men, and the consequent as His determination to save those who believe, and condemn unbelievers: the one preceding the act of the human will accepting or rejecting the Gospel, and regarding it indifferently; and the other waiting upon the human will in its choice, and acting accordingly. We find Hooker, in his reply to the "Christian Letter,"—one of the sharpest stings of which was the accusation that he had allowed himself to be "seduced by the vain distinctions of the witty schoolmen,"—confessing that he took this distinction, as well as another about the absolute and conditioned will of God, from Damascene, but in both cases in the possible Calvinistic sense. In his "Answer" to Travers, there is a strong statement with regard to the latter distinction; but it amounts to nothing more than a repudiation of Supralapsarianism. And in this Paul's Cross sermon, it is probable that he applied the distinction of "antecedent" and "consequent" simply to the preceptive will of God, with the practical design of pressing on his hearers the duty of Gospel faith and repentance; shewing the freeness of the Gospel call by the antecedent will of God, and the certainty of the result of salvation or damnation, according as they received or rejected the Gospel, by His consequent will. Baro appears to have used the distinction in the anti-Calvinistic sense. Hooker, therefore, is not to be confounded with Baro; and though he adopted Damascene's distinctions, he did not, as we learn from a statement in one of his sermons, approve of the Greek Church theology. But they had, perhaps, a disintegrating and misleading effect on his views. He seems to have felt a powerful recoil from the doctrine of particular atonement, and to have been much impressed with the risk of men being led by the doctrine of electing grace to pursue their salvation in a slothful way, if not to abandon the pursuit in indifference or despair; and these modifications or shrinkings may shew that he did not rightly apprehend the true bearings of Calvinistic principles. Whether consistently or not, however, he appears really to have held the doctrine of a sovereign, particular, and effectual decree of electing grace. Even the first book of the Ecclesiastical Polity, applauded as it is by men who are caught by its philosophic breadth, but are of a totally different spirit, shews that, in the depths of his heart, there lay the ineradi-

cable conviction of a divine law, sovereignly super-imposed and inflexibly administered,—a principle that might be glossed over or accommodated to the temporary occasions of argument, but which, with whatever confusion of statement, constantly reappears in his writings down to the very latest.

II. That there was a considerable difference between Hooker's religious leanings, in the earlier and in the later periods of his life, appears very plainly, if we compare two of his extant sermons with the fifth book of his "Ecclesiastical Polity" and others of his later writings. These two sermons are on the same text—Jude 17–21, and if the reader will look at the passage, he will see that it was well fitted to elicit the preacher's characteristic views and feelings with regard to the main topics—theological, ecclesiastical, and religious—which agitated society at the time. It is no wonder that Mr Keble is disposed to dispute the genuineness of these sermons, or, at least, to relegate them to his earlier days,—they present so vivid a contrast to those semi-Romish tenets and habits of mind which Mr Keble would ascribe to him as marking his ripest years, and for which there is too much colour in his latest writings. With regard to the Scriptures, the place and nature of faith and of the sacraments, the sources, vital elements and proper cast of spiritual life, his representations and way of speaking are those of a warm-hearted Puritan; while with regard to the condition of the Church of England, its evils and defects, the tone is scarcely less decidedly in the same key. The absolute divinity of the origin of the Scriptures, and their solitary authority in religion, are strongly stated:

> The sacred writers "neither spake nor wrote any word of their own, but uttered syllable by syllable as the Spirit put it into their mouths, no otherwise than the harp or the lute doth give a sound according to the discretion of his hands that holdeth and striketh it with skill." "We have no Lord but Jesus, no doctrine but the Gospel, no teachers but His apostles." Their principal matter is, "the doctrine of salvation to be looked for by faith."

In the spiritual life it is faith, not the sacraments, that holds the foremost place. By it we are united to Christ, and by it alone we enter into the enjoyment of every privilege, and obtain a continual and final triumph. The sacrament of the

Supper is, indeed, spoken of very warmly as an important means of grace; but it is only a confirming seal of grace already received, a means of professing that we have received it and are living according to it, and therefore giving occasion to a strict personal scrutiny as to our actual spiritual condition:

"Ere we put forth our hands to take of this blessed sacrament, we are charged to examine and try our hearts whether God be in us or no." The sacrament is "a seal unto us that we are His house and His sanctuary; that His Christ is as truly united to me as my arm is united and knit unto my shoulder; that He dwelleth in me as verily as the elements of bread and wine abide within me." It is not the sacraments that create and constitute this intimate union; "that which linketh Christ to us is His mere mercy and love towards us; that which tieth us to Him is our faith in the promised salvation revealed in the word of truth."

The preacher mistakes, indeed, the meaning of the word *faith* in his text, taking it as the subjective grace instead of the *fides quæ creditur*, to which he was partly led by the existing translation; but this gives occasion for the exhibition of his views of the supreme place of faith in the Christian life:

"The thing prescribed is faith. For as in a chain which is made of many links, if you pull the first you draw the rest; and as in a ladder of many staves, if you take away the lowest, all hope of ascending to the highest will be removed; so, because all the precepts and promises in the law and in the Gospel do hang upon this, *Believe;* and because the last of the graces of God doth so follow the first, that He glorifieth none but whom He hath justified, nor justifieth any but whom He hath called to a true, effectual, and lively faith in Christ Jesus; therefore St Jude, exhorting us to *build ourselves*, mentioneth here expressly only faith as the thing wherein we must be edified; for that faith is the ground and the glory of all the welfare of this building."

With regard to justification by faith, no doubt is left as to the preacher's meaning. It is by faith alone. The Romanist doctrine is vigorously denounced, and justification is declared to be complete and permanent:

"Imputation of righteousness hath covered the sins of every soul which believeth; God, by pardoning our sin, hath taken it away; so that now, although our transgressions be multiplied above the hairs of our head, yet being justified, we are as free and as clear as if there were no one spot or stain of any uncleanness in us."

It is not faith itself, however highly exalted, that forms the matter of imputed righteousness; it is the virtue of Christ.

And those who have this faith in truth, will persevere unto complete salvation. Apostates were "amongst us, not of us."

"We marvel not at their departure, neither are we prejudiced by their falling away, because they were not of us, sith they are fleshly, and have not the Spirit. The children abide in the house for ever."

Of our personal possession of this saving grace, so fruitful in privileges and blessings, we may and ought to have a full assurance. This is very strongly put:

"It is as easy a matter for the Spirit within you to tell whose ye are, as for the eyes of your body to judge where you sit, or in what place you stand."

This strength of language with regard to assurance of faith, betokens the writer's nearness to the times of the Reformation, when, as is well known, it was held by many in a form that is not now regarded as warrantable, going far to make assurance to be of the essence of faith. But to this subject we must presently refer, in connection with another sermon, where we shall find Hooker holding different language from that which is now before us. It must be remarked, however, that strongly as he speaks here of the duty and attainableness of assurance, he does not speak of it as a part, or as an immediate and inevitable accompaniment, of faith. It is the result of a process of introspection and examination of one's personal character and habits, and an object of prayer.

"The Lord of His infinite mercy give us hearts plentifully fraught with the treasure of this blessed assurance of faith unto the end."

It may be thought that we are dwelling to a wearisome extent on these two sermons, but the truth is, that they shew us one half of Hooker's inner history, and we shall immediately have to begin tracing a process of change. One topic yet remains, too, which must not be left out. When the writer comes to speak of the "mockers" of his text, one is curious to see how he will treat the two parties by whom the Church of England was then assailed—the Puritans and the Papists. What, at the date of this sermon, were his relations to the Puritans, and what did he think of their pretensions and complaints? In the first place, he treats them very differently from the Papists. These he regards as irreconcilable enemies, with whom there are to be no terms, and he meets them boldly, confuting their errors with scorn. But with a view to the

charges of the Puritans, he goes on to speak of the faults and shortcomings of the Church of England in a way which must have gratified many of them, if they formed, as one cannot but fancy, a large portion of his audience. There is no flaunting presentation of an episcopal platform, no distinguishing of clergy and laity, not a word about holy places and days, nothing about crossings and kneelings. Bishops are only mentioned once; the words *clergy* and *laity* do not occur; the ministers are pastors, each of them feeding his own flock, and holding his office for the good of the Church alone. The ministry is indeed a standing office, but only for external administration. The relations of the magistrate are briefly referred to, and are described as merely *circa sacra;* and it is most noteworthy, that the rule by which he is to be guided is not human reason or expediency, which is the main position of the "Ecclesiastical Polity," but the Word of God,—"the rule which cannot deceive, even as Moses provided that all things might be done according to the pattern which he saw in the mount." The chief interest lies in Scriptural representations of a good pastor, and in a strong picture of the shameful inconsistencies of many pastors of the time, along with a solemn appeal to these on their responsibilities. Then, turning to the people, he speaks as if they were all Puritans, and had too good ground for their accusations. He supposes them lamenting over the existing Church, in comparison with that of the apostles' days, as Israel did over the meanness of the second temple; and "filled with indignation" while they think of—

"priests made of the refuse of the people, men . . . . unable to discern between the right hand and the left, . . . . leaving their flocks, . . . . entering upon holy things, as spoils, without a reverend calling, . . . . leaders so unkindly affected towards them, that they could find in their hearts to sell them as sheep or oxen, not caring how they made them away."

There is even a glance at "what duty Zerubbabel or Jehoshua doth owe unto God in this respect," and at their failure therein. These were the very charges which the Puritans brought against the existing condition of the Church. How does the preacher meet them? He does not deny them. He implicitly admits them; and then, turning again to the people, he reminds them that if they were not "disobedient children, God would give

them pastors according to His own heart," and therefore the only course is for them to begin a reformation in themselves. And so the discourse ends.

These sermons, when viewed in connection with Hooker's later writings and history, are so remarkable, that it has been seriously questioned whether they are really his. Mr Keble, who claims Hooker as holding substantially his own views, which have developed into the Ritualism of our day, admits that he underwent a change from the time when he was the grateful follower of his patron, Jewel, and the docile disciple of his tutor, Reynolds; but he hardly likes to admit so great a change as these sermons would shew. He therefore argues against their genuineness, resting chiefly on the difference of style and contrariety of sentiment from what is found in his other writings. His argument will not bear close examination. The style indeed is different; it is more rapid and warm; but may not a man have different styles in addressing different hearers or readers, for different purposes, and at different periods of his life? It would be easy to point out numerous phrases and minute turns of thought that bear a close resemblance to Hooker's style in his acknowledged writings, and which, when taken cumulatively, remove all objection on this score. There is a difference also in sentiment, but it is not so great as Mr Keble would make out. Especially there is apparently a wide difference on the subject of assurance of salvation, from the ground taken in a notable sermon which is presently to come before us, but it will be found that though assurance is there put somewhat in discredit as a common attainment, the absolute perpetuity of true faith is powerfully asserted, and the object is to encourage and produce assurance. The truth is, as we take it, that Hooker was more of a Puritan at the beginning, and less of a Ritualist at the end, than Mr Keble represents. There was a change, but it began farther back, and did not go so far forward. As to the external evidence for these sermons, it is quite as good as what we have for two others that are not doubted of. They were found amongst Hooker's papers, and were published by Jackson, the zealous editor of his writings, shortly after his death.

An interesting question now arises with regard to the time when Hooker wrote them. There is a reference in one of them to a "space of four-and-twenty years," during which the

Church of England had been specially attacked by the Papists. This period might begin at the accession of Elizabeth in 1558, which would fix the date of the sermons at 1582; or when the Pope's bull of excommunication was issued, 1570, which would carry them forward to 1594. Mr Keble fluctuates in opinion, speaking differently in his preface and in his footnotes. But it is hardly credible that Hooker could have written such sermons in 1594, when the first four books were published, and the remainder already sketched out of his "Polity." We are therefore shut up to the earlier period, and the result at which we arrive is, that Hooker was then a moderate Puritan, approving of the "discipline" and the general views of the party, fully sympathising in their style of religious thought, but conforming to the Church as it stood, in the hope of better times to come,—times which, by and bye, he unhappily did his best to put off for ever.

III. There are two other sermons, the date of which it is hard to settle, and we shall not attempt it, but it may be as well to take them in here. We have spoken of a man having different styles. In one of these sermons Hooker is in his philosophical vein. It is a funeral sermon on John xiv. 27, and as such it is a failure; it is too intellectual in substance, and too artificial and cold in manner. But it is impossible for Hooker to write anything that shall not be somehow interesting; and there is a philosophical analysis of the affections of grief and fear — distinguishing between the sinful and sinless indulgence of them—which is attractive, though in some parts questionable. One sparkling sentence with regard to threatened evils of a formidable character which may not excite fear, has elicited one of Coleridge's high-flown criticisms:—"Perceive we not how they, whose tenderness shrinketh at the least raze of a needle's point, do kiss the sword that pierceth them quite thorow?" This Coleridge calls either a truism or a dangerous fallacy, and he has some transcendental talk about the soul and its essential existence, to which he extends Hooker's remark; whereas Hooker is merely thinking of temporal life, and of the occasions when, with a sufficient motive, the most fastidiously sensitive will rush upon any danger. The other of the two sermons referred to, on Matthew vii. 7, 8, does not call for any notice, except that it proceeds on a false interpretation,—a

thing not uncommon with Hooker, with whom exegesis is never a strong point.

IV. The remaining sermons may be classified as the Temple sermons. They were probably delivered when Hooker was Master of the Temple, as part of a series on Habakkuk, the others not being extant. We find ourselves here in a different atmosphere, and have to deal, as it might almost seem, with a different man. We are in the midst of controversy, and Hooker appears much more as an intellectualist, with a decided tendency to apologise for the Church of Rome. He is full of exceptions and negations, and keeps paring at the truth till (to use an expression of Owen's somewhere) there is a risk of its blood being drawn and its life flying away. His Puritanism, such as it was, must have been shaken before he came to the Temple, and the antagonism immediately set up between him and Travers seems to have gone far to complete his conversion. It was doubtless the danger of Puritanism, that it tended so to exalt and intensify religious experience as to breed despair or hypocrisy in the case of some; and, on the other hand, it was the tendency of Conformity to lower religious life into a freezing harmony with its essential indifferentism, or to change it into the contrary type of Popery. If Hooker was now escaping from the one extreme, he was in danger of falling into the other.

The first of these sermons is on the nature of faith; the second, a celebrated one, on justification; and the third, which will not call for much remark, is nominally on the nature of pride, but really a collection of short discourses on various topics. The sermon on "The Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect," drew from Coleridge this warm eulogium:

"I can remember no other discourse that sinks into, and draws up comfort from the depths of our being below our own distinct consciousness, with the clearness and godly loving-kindness of this truly evangelical, God-to-be-thanked-for sermon."[1]

The eulogium is merited; not a few have had to thank Hooker for this sermon; but it is for the latter portion only, and not for the former. Coleridge is himself a proof of this; for the fundamental position of the first part exercised his mind, from time to time, with varying judgment, for about a

[1] "Notes on English Divines," vol i. p. 29.

year, and he finally decided against Hooker. Owen, too, seems to have had this sermon in his view when writing the most original of his works, "The Reason of Faith." Hooker seems here to come into conflict with some of the most cherished views of the Reformers; and the question raised has intimate relations with the modern discussions as to the nature of faith.

In a previous sermon at the Temple, Hooker had asserted that "the assurance of things which we believe by the word is not so certain as of that we perceive by sense." It looks as if nothing but the spirit of mischief-making could have led him to hazard this assertion, at a time when his hearers were ready to fasten on anything in the least suspicious. Nothing seemed to be more at war with the language of the continental Reformers, and of the Homilies and all the best English divines, regarding "divine, supernatural, lively, certain faith," in opposition to the "doubtsome faith" of the Church of Rome. This assertion was therefore at once laid hold of by Travers, and forms part of his indictment against Hooker in his "Supplication to the Council." Yet Hooker did not flinch from it. When it was first questioned, he immediately preached the sermon before us; and in his "Answer" to Travers, after repeating the statement already given, he proceeds to give the gist of his argument:

"I have taught," he saith, "that the assurance of things which we believe by the Word, is not so certain as of that we perceive by sense. And is it as certain? Yea, I taught, as he himself I trust will not deny, that the things which God doth promise in His Word are surer unto us than anything we touch, handle, or see. But are we so sure and certain of them? If we be, why doth God so often prove His promises unto us, as He doth, by arguments taken from our sensible experience? We must be surer of the proof than of the thing proved, otherwise it is no proof. How is it, that if ten men do all look upon the moon, every one of them knoweth it as certainly to be the moon as another; but many believing one and the same promise, all have not one and the same fulness of persuasion? How falleth it out, that men being assured of anything by sense, can be no surer of it than they are; whereas the strongest in faith that liveth upon the earth, hath always need to labour, and strive, and pray, that his assurance concerning heavenly and spiritual things may grow, increase, and be augmented?"

This is plausible enough, and yet who that knows the worth and power of faith, can be satisfied with it? Did the martyrs, when they endured the most exquisite torments, and gave up

dear life, hating father and mother, wife and child, for Christ's sake and the gospel's, and doing it all joyfully, with songs of triumph, rest on an assurance so feeble as this with regard to the very reality of that for which they forsook all? The variety in the degrees of faith, on which Hooker dwells largely in the sermon, is of no proper account in the argument; for the faith of the martyrs is only an extension and enhancement of that which, in its lowest degree, is of the same kind. As for the *proofs* in Scripture, taken from sensible things, there is an ambiguity in the word; they are not positive reasons in support of propositions, but illustrations and analogies drawn from the near and present objects and ordinary transactions of earthly life, which God condescends to use, for the sake of deepening our impressions of spiritual things and enlivening our faith. But for the essential ground of faith we have only the naked asseverations of the Divine testimony, and the intrinsic excellence of their contents. These asseverations, when the soul is prepared by the Holy Spirit, are seen in the light of their infallible truthfulness, are received with the seal of conscience and the embrace of the heart, and are rested upon as an immovable rock. It is not at all a question regarding the evidence of the fact of a Divine testimony, but regarding the nature of saving faith. Hooker assumes "the Word" to be the undoubted Word of God, as well as his opponents. The only question is as to the nature of that certainty with which men rest on an admitted Divine testimony, when their faith is the result of an operation of the Holy Ghost upon their hearts, and infallibly leads to their salvation. The whole of the latter part of the sermon is, in fact, devoted to a demonstration of the certain permanence and final triumph of that faith, which he nevertheless, in the first portion, describes as carrying a weaker assurance than the perceptions of sense. It would have been nearer the truth for him to say that such faith is accompanied with a certitude equal to that of sensible perception, since it is commonly represented in Scripture by metaphors taken from sensible and physical acts—seeing, tasting, hearing, coming, fleeing, &c. His whole argument from the imperfection of faith is indeed a fallacious one, for he speaks as if the bodily senses were universally perfect, whereas they may be and often are dull and uncertain in this action, as well as the spiritual faculty of faith.

In the sermon, Hooker tries to help the matter by the use of an old distinction of the schoolmen (*suo more*) between the "Certainty of Evidence," and the "Certainty of Adherence;"—the former may be quite feeble at the very time when the latter is nearly perfect. But what is this certainty of evidence? Nothing but vividness of perception. It is not the result of proof, as might be supposed, but simply a clear manifestation to the mind of that which is already believed to be true; the certainty of evidency, not of evidence properly so called. And the certainty of adherence is a conviction of the excellence of the objects in question, and therefore a love of them and cleaving to them at whatever cost. Now, this distinction, as here used, is liable to two objections. First, it is a change of ground; for the question is not about a present vivid perception, but about a belief in the reality of things. And Coleridge has well remarked, that a mathematician may not have the same feeling of certainty as to the results of the transcendental algebra as with regard to the conclusions of simple geometry, without having less actual certainty. The second remark is, that it is very questionable whether the relative proportions of the two certainties were ever found in real life as they are here represented. It seems absurd in the nature of things to suppose a certainty of adherence, without an equal proportion of the certainty of evidence. The whole of Hebrews xi. proceeds on this principle; the Psalter, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and indeed all scripture, so far as it exhibits the experience of God's saints, shows the same thing. Hooker quotes a well known passage from Job (xiii. 15), as if it were decisive—"Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him," but he completely misunderstands it; it is simply an expression of perfect resignation in the midst of outward affliction.[1] Some other passages, as Isa. l. 10, have been in like manner greatly abused. And in those cases in which spiritual darkness seems to co-exist with the "certainty of adherence," it will be found that the darkness really rests on the question of a personal assurance of the possession of the divine favour, and not on the perception of the reality and excellence of scripture truths. It may appear to be otherwise, but it is

[1] See Delitzch *in loc.* See also President Edward's second letter to Gillespie appended to his *Religious Affections.*

only an appearance. Hooker himself describes the case of a man in despair who professes to have lost all faith in Christian truth, but he admirably handles the case with the effect of showing, that there *must* be such faith where the truth itself is loved; "which argument," he says, "all the subtilty of infernal powers will never be able to dissolve."

When he goes on to talk of the difference between the light of glory and the light of grace, and the inferiority of the latter, he forgets that the whole question is as to *certainty* of knowledge, which may be the same in both states, while there is a difference as to its extent and its vividness. The same remark holds good with regard to the work of the Spirit upon the soul. The Holy Spirit, whom Hooker admits to be the author of faith, is a Spirit of adoption and consolation, and produces all the highest acts of the Christian life; and the only internal instrument He uses in carrying on this grand process to perfection is the new faculty or energy He has created—faith. Can it, then, be as feeble in its very roots as Hooker represents? He thinks he answers the objection to his position from this source, by saying that the Spirit does not operate like a natural agent with all the force of which He is capable, but only so far as to accomplish the intended design,—enough for salvation, but not for perfection. But the question remains, whether the result of the Spirit's "mighty working" (Eph. i. 19, 20; ii. 1), does not include a certain conviction of the objective reality of those things about which all spiritual life is exercised, and without which objective reality spiritual life is an utter nullity?

It is often seen in Hooker that he introduces arguments which add only bulk to his statements, without any ground of truth in them fit to bear a moment's examination. He presumes too much on the obtuseness of his readers, or contemptuously thinks that the flimsiest sophism is good enough for them. Thus in demonstrating the necessary imperfection of faith, he says that if it were perfect it would make us independent of the justifying righteousness of Christ. "For righteousness inherent being perfect will justify," and faith is the mother of all Christian virtues. Of whom is he speaking?—of men or angels? Does he think he can make us forget the fact that, there being sin in our past history at least, though we should now attain the most unsullied purity, yet,

without Christ's righteousness, heaven's gates must be shut in our faces? This sophism has altogether a Romish look.

On the whole, the earlier part of this sermon, instead of bearing the title "The Certainty," should rather have been styled "The Uncertainty of the Faith of God's Elect." It is an unhappy specimen of the fallacious sort of argument, and vitiated representation of Christian truth and experience, which the position amongst church parties Hooker was now taking up was fitted to produce. The latter portion is very different. It is a demonstration of the unfailing continuance of true faith, whatever struggles it may have to pass through, or however it may for a time sicken or be eclipsed. Its perpetuity is rested on the promises of God, and on the faithfulness and effectual intercession of Christ. It is traced through many conflicts in which it sometimes seems utterly to fail, but it always revives, and "continues invincible." Following P. Martyr and one or two other Reformers, but departing from the common language of the time, assurance of salvation is described as "a separable accident," not an essential element of saving faith; and the general design is to comfort weak believers, and build them up to a full assurance of hope. Some exceptions might be taken to particular statements, but Hooker contrasts here favourably with Saravia, the intimate friend of his later days, and a notable divine of the time. At the request of Whitgift, Saravia wrote a paper in connection with the Barrett affair at Cambridge, with the view of estimating the soundness of Barrett's statements. Amongst these was an assertion that temporary faith is of the same nature as saving faith. This Saravia defends with the usual Arminian arguments. At the time when Hooker wrote this sermon, therefore—1585, ten years before Saravia's paper, he affords us clear proof that the Church of England had not as yet made any departure from the Calvinism of her early days. This circumstance of itself gives an interest to the sermon, but the latter portion of it is most valuable on its own account. There is much felicitous scripture illustration, a tender and solemn dealing with some of the most delicate phases of Christian life, and a concluding exhibition of the certainty of the believer's hope, that can hardly fail to leave a profound impression, and confer lasting profit on the reader.

V. "A Learned Discourse on Justification, Works, and how the Foundation of Faith is Overthrown." This famous sermon is, perhaps, the most remarkable proof which remains to us of the intellectual greatness of Hooker. The first book of the Ecclesiastical Polity, no doubt, shows him rising easily and grandly into a loftier region, and calmly and reverently surveying the wide fields which are visible from that altitude. But if he there proves the breadth and elevation of his mind, here we best perceive its wonderful strength of grasp and subtilty. Nowhere, too, is his style more clear, vigorous, weighty, and withal graceful. We have before us, indeed, a masterpiece of dialectical and rhetorical art. The circumstances that gave rise to the sermon, seem to have fairly roused him to the utmost exertion of his powers and the strenuous application of his various learning.

It seems ("Answer to Travers") that in a previous discourse he had been engaged "in settling the difference between the Church of Rome and us about grace and justification." He "took it for the best and most perspicuous way of teaching, to declare first, how far we do agree, and then to show our disagreement." The jealous ears of Travers and his party immediately caught up some statements which were to them unusual. Hooker taught, according to Travers ("Supplication"):

"That the Church of Rome is a true Church of Christ, and a sanctified Church by profession of the truth which God hath revealed unto us by His Son, though not a pure and perfect Church;" and "that he doubted not, but that thousands of the fathers which lived and died in the superstitions of that Church, were saved, because of their ignorance which excused them."

Travers thought it necessary to correct this doctrine by maintaining:

"That such as die, or have died at any time in the Church of Rome, holding in their ignorance that faith which is taught in it, and namely, justification in part by works, could not be said by the Scriptures to be saved;" supplementing this, however, by the admission, "that it was not indeed to be doubted but many of the fathers were saved, but the means was not their ignorance, which excuseth no man with God, but their knowledge and faith of the truth, which, it appeareth, God vouchsafed them, by many notable monuments and records extant of it in all ages."

These statements on both sides seem to have been put in a brief, incidental way; but they presently led to a sharp and determined conflict. Hooker, much aggrieved by Travers' correction, on the next Sabbath devoted his sermon to a full

and express discussion of the question as to the salvability of Roman Catholics. Travers, preaching in the afternoon, replied in a short address at the end of his sermon. The next step was the climax. Hooker returned to the subject on the following Sabbath, adducing new arguments, and reiterating his former assertions with fresh energy. The congregation, doubtless,—composed, as it was, of lawyers,—were on tiptoe for Travers' reply in the afternoon; but this was prevented by Whitgift's interposition, depriving Travers of all his ministerial functions.[1] Mr Keble seems to take the extant sermon to be the last of the three now mentioned. It is more likely, from its great length and fulness, as well as from some confusion of arrangement, to be a combination of the two last, drawn up with a view to Hooker's defence before the Council, if necessary. Though the fruit of much labour, and maintaining nothing from which he afterwards departed,—on the contrary, the same views are presented with increased boldness in the "Polity,"—it was not published by Hooker. On its first appearance, twelve years after his death, it excited so much attention, that the edition was immediately bought up, and a second appeared the following year.

To appreciate Hooker's argument in this sermon, it is necessary to keep in view the precise question at issue, and the circumstances of the time which gave it importance. The question was not simply whether Roman Catholics might be saved, as Dean Stanley and others, who do not pay sufficient regard to the accuracy of their statements, have put it. Travers, as we have seen, admitted this. The rêal question was, whether Roman Catholics might be saved, "which lived and died in the superstitions of that Church, because of their ignorance, which excused them." They are supposed not only to have lived, but also to have died, in the practice and under the tuition of Popish superstition; and it is asserted that because they knew no better, the flaws in their religious condition might be overlooked by a merciful God. Their plea before Him might be sufficient, though it was a plea not of faith but of ignorance. We cannot wonder that two men like Hooker and Travers should feel so keenly on this question when once raised. It was one of the principal objections of the Puritans to the existing constitution of the Church of

[1] See narrative in former Article, *B. & F. Ev. R.*, No. LXXXV. p. 423.

England, that it was Popish. It was Popish in its hierarchical structure, in its rites and vestments. This tended to hinder the conversion of Papists from the Church of Rome, or to attract them into the English Church without abandoning their Popery; it left a most dangerous opening for the return of Popery; and it was in itself offensive to enlightened Protestants. The Puritan, therefore, abhorred Popery with all his heart. Hooker, on the contrary, becoming more and more a defender of the Church of England as it stood, was led to take a mitigated view of the evils and dangers of Popery, and to think more kindly of the relations it might be possible to sustain towards it. But in taking this line he ran no slight risks. Was Protestant doctrine to suffer in his hands, while he laboured to represent Popery in its most favourable light? Was a handle to be given to Rome for the charge of schism against Protestants, as separating from a Church in which it was laboriously proved that the risk to man's salvation was so small? Was any countenance to be given to Origen's notion of universal mercy? It was obviously needful for Hooker to tread warily; for he was proposing to tread the very brink of the precipice, the razor-edge between truth and error. It is astonishing how well he succeeded, or appeared to succeed, in this, notwithstanding an occasional boldness of language which must have made Travers' blood run cold, and though at the expense of considerable sophistry. Let us trace the process.

The text is Hab. i. 4 (according to the existing translation), "The wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore perverse judgment doth proceed." The whole question is, who are the righteous, and who are the wicked? Hooker adopts an old Rabbinical interpretation, which is quite untenable, by which the wicked are the Chaldeans, and the righteous Judah, and thus gains some advantage for his object, by finding that a people who still hold the truth by profession, though exceedingly corrupt in manners,—like Judah, "a sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity,"—may yet, according to Scripture, receive the designation "righteous;" and he would insinuate that Papists may be in the same position. But afterwards he is well pleased if he be allowed to class them with Samaria (Israel under Jeroboam and his successors); a more allowable comparison, though not a flattering one, seeing that the ten tribes, so far as they adopted Jeroboam's scheme

of worship, were thoroughly apostate from God. Still there were doubtless many true worshippers of God among them, and prophets were not awanting. But he goes too far when he speaks of Samaria as better than Babylon in God's sight, for its guilt is continually represented as far greater.

Concerning the truly righteous, none are so in themselves, —all are sinners; even the blessed Virgin, though for Christ's sake he would speak tenderly of her, was a sinner, and the blood which Christ took from her He paid for her:

"'The world must shew a Christian man, otherwise it is not able to shew a man that is perfectly righteous.' And concerning Christian righteousness, 'There is a glorifying righteousness of man in the world to come, and there is a justifying and a sanctifying righteousness here. The righteousness wherewith we shall be clothed in the world to come is both perfect and inherent. That whereby we are justified is perfect, but not inherent. That whereby we are sanctified, inherent, but not perfect.'"

This statement leads immediately to "that grand question which hangeth yet in controversy between us and the Church of Rome, about the matter of justifying righteousness." On this the question of the salvability of Roman Catholics is made to turn. There follows, therefore, first, a statement of the amount of agreement between the two parties on this subject, and then of disagreement. To one not familiar with the methods of Popish controversy, the amount of agreement with Protestants which they can plead seems to be such as to take away all real difference,—they can talk so loudly about the grace of God and the merits of Christ; and so it came to be stated by later English divines, as by Burnet in his book on the Articles. Not so with Hooker. He shews that the difference is "about the nature of the very essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease; about the manner of applying it; about the number and the power of means which God requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our soul's comfort."

Then follows a minute though condensed account of the Romish system, thoroughly fair and clear, and closing thus: "This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread, when they ask her the way of justification." A counter statement of Protestant doctrine is then given; and respecting it and all

other representations of the doctrine of justification in this sermon, we shall only say, that those who would ascribe to Hooker anything else than sound Reformation doctrine, must find their materials elsewhere. Mr Keble is painfully unfair and unwarranted in claiming Hooker as substantially at one with Bull. They differ essentially and totally. Tried by any one of the tests of Reformed doctrine,—the nature, the ground, the method, the instrument, or the results of justification,—he is not awanting. It is true he has some patristic and scholastic terms which tend to bring in confusion, such as *meriting*, in the sense of obtaining, and *justice* or *righteousness*, as applied both to justification and sanctification, and the distinction of *habitual* and *actual justice* or holiness. But the sense in which they are used is manifestly Protestant. Notwithstanding that he is pleading hard for a wide charity towards Romanists, still Rome is Babylon, and teaches "so many things pernicious to Christian faith, . . . that the very foundation of faith which they hold is thereby plainly overthrown, and the force of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ extinguished." And there are passages in this sermon, setting forth leading elements in this fundamental branch of truth, which, for clearness, fulness, and power, are hardly to be matched in Christian literature.

But we hasten to the discussion of the question that gave rise to the discourse. Having in the previous portion done something to clear himself of all complicity with the Romish system, the presumption was gained that it could be but a venial error, if it were an error, which he was now about to maintain. He states the question as twofold: "Whether our fathers, infected with Popish errors and superstitions, might be saved?" and, "Whether their ignorance be a reasonable inducement to make us think that they might?" And taking up as a passage of Scripture bearing on the subject, Rev. xviii. 4, "Go out of her, my people," &c., he admits its application to the Church of Rome, and that the plagues meant are everlasting destruction. But then what is that precise participation in the sins of Babylon which infers participation in her plagues? The heresies of Rome are deadly, but the practice to which they lead may be dissociated from an intelligent belief in them. The inventors and teachers of them, and those who know them to be errors, yet for worldly ends

make outward profession of them as truth, Hooker gives over to inevitable condemnation, if they repent not. But the people, the ignorant multitude, some driven by fear, some seduced by guile, are they all to be "plunged in that infernal and flaming lake?" "Woe worth the hour wherein we were born, except we might persuade ourselves better things."

Still condemnation is due, and though there is mercy with God there is also wrath: "which mercy we do not with Origen extend to devils and damned spirits." There is no mercy for "the fathers" "if they were altogether faithless and impenitent." They were faithless if they did not hold the foundation of faith. But might not many of them hold it as by a slender thread, and build upon it much perishable material, while yet they might be saved? What is the foundation? and what is it not to hold it? Generally, it is the writings of the evangelists and apostles; more particularly, it is Christ. How many millions have died in the Church of Rome, confessing "Christ my Saviour, my Redeemer Jesus!" But it is replied that this is consistent enough with perdition. The Galatians were told that if they were circumcised, Christ should profit them nothing. Christ is alone in the work of salvation. Admitted; but the addition to Christ that is in question, is not to His work of redemption, but to the application of it. The Church of Rome does overthrow the foundation "by consequent," but *not directly.* If some of the Galatians, perfect in the faith and loving it, were guilty of the sole error about circumcision and died before they were admonished by Paul, must they perish? They, like Rome, overthrew the foundation by consequent; but was not Luther's error about the ubiquity of the body of Christ of the same tendency?

As for repentance, it is two-fold in its nature,—repentance for sins known, and for sins unknown,—and may not this extension cover the case of many Roman Catholics dying in penitence? Here Hooker supposes an outburst of indignation. This doctrine of repentance would take in all sorts of men. For men who have denied the foundation of faith, without a particular repentance of that error, there is no salvation. So it was with the Galatians (Gal. v. 2, 4), and so with Roman Catholics holding with their church (2 Thess. ii. 10–12). Those in that church who were saved held the foundation—Christ alone. Hooker's reply turns upon the question of a

*direct* denial of the foundation of faith. Supposing that the Romish doctrine is a direct denial, still multitudes were ignorant of its meaning, or professed it by mere custom, and while holding other heresies, denied this regarding justification by works, or held it in a general form of words which might cover a true faith in Christ alone. Under the last head, he appeals to the general admission of the necessity of works to salvation, and to the strong language of James, which he reconciles with that of Paul on the footing that while justification may be spoken of as not implying sanctification, it may also be spoken of as implying it. Then, the efficient cause of sanctification is the Spirit of adoption, whose first movement in the heart is the root of all Christian virtues which are afterwards produced; and the same movement is the root or cause of that faith which receives the imputed righteousness of Christ. Here it is plain that Hooker treads on the very line of demarcation, and it must be owned that, while he does not really cross it, he might easily be supposed to do so. The Romish distinction of two kinds of sanctification, habitual and actual, is adopted. The first, which is the commencement of the Spirit's work, is identical in point of time with receiving the external righteousness of Christ, but in point of order the work of the Spirit producing faith comes first. So far well; but why does he speak of it as sanctifying in its nature, when it is as yet but spiritual life or regeneration? A certain amount of confusion is the necessary result. Still this very confusion of thought is precisely that which might exist in the mind of a Roman Catholic, who really trusted in Christ alone for justification, while he might be fettered by a form of words about works. This view Hooker tries to strengthen by referring to the ancient use of the word *meriting*, in the sense of *obtaining;* but it is liable to the exception, which he does not sufficiently allow for, that the word is differently used in the Romish views of justification. To these arguments it is added that a deathbed makes a great difference on men's fancies about standing before the great Judge on the ground of personal merit; and there is an admirable passage, shewing how such "idle imaginations" totally disappear before the face of death, "to name merits is to lay the soul upon the rack," and there is "no staff to lean upon, no ease, no rest, no comfort there, but only in Christ Jesus."

Hitherto Hooker has reasoned on the footing of his opponents—that Rome directly denies the foundation of saving faith. Now he boldly adventures on the opposite tack. The Church of Rome, even at the worst, does not directly deny the foundation,—she does so *by consequent.* The denial may be plainly and inevitably deduced from her doctrine, but that there is a direct denial he "utterly denies." This is a remarkable line of argument,—not new, certainly, for it was precisely the object of the decrees of the Council of Trent to bring about this state of the question. But why is Hooker so urgent about it? Why so determined to say as much as can by any means be said in behalf of the safety of Roman Catholics? It is not from a wider charity than his opponents had; for, after all, his admissions of a virtual denial of the foundation of saving faith are so full, that the conclusions of his opponents with regard to the perils of Popery are hardly at all shaken. It seems rather to have sprung from the feeling that his reputation as a scholar and divine had been attacked when his original statement had been questioned, and especially from his growing dislike of Puritanism in every one of its forms.

Some of his former positions are now resumed, some new ones are taken up, and he carefully guards himself from the objections to which he has exposed himself. What is the foundation of faith? Here he is conveniently vague. It is the way of salvation through Christ and His death. But this, of course, is admitted by Romanists; they make no question about the person and vicarious death of Christ the Saviour. At this point, he is careful to repudiate the notion of some of the old Greek fathers, that the heathens might be called Christians constructively, because they hold some truths of natural theology. But the repudiation is not distinct; and in truth, his position with regard to Papists is nearly identical; for it is only a constructive Christianity that he can plead for them. Can the elect of God ever directly deny the foundation? This is the next point. Here there is a strong statement of the absolute indefectibility of grace, the certain and unfailing perseverance of the saints, which Hooker appears to have held with the most profound conviction. But this only secures the elect from "plain infidelity, extreme despair, hatred of God, and all godliness, obduration in sin;" not from other grievous errors

and sins, out of which they will be brought by an actual repentance, or which, if unwitting, will be forgiven. Thus there remains still the difference between errors of ignorance and stubborn heresy. Those who are guilty of the latter, the apostle calls "dogs,"—the ignorant errorist he treats with fatherly tenderness. "The heresy of freewill was a millstone about the Pelagians' necks; shall we therefore give sentence of death inevitable against all those fathers in the Greek Church which, being mispersuaded, died in the error of freewill?" The Galatian argument is now resumed, with some additions. The original broachers of the circumcision heresy would not have been described as "certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed," if they had directly denied the foundation. And the whole warning to the Galatians, as in danger of falling from grace and losing all benefit from Christ, implied that they knew and believed that "in Christ, in grace, their salvation lay, which is a plain direct acknowledgment of the foundation."

The last question is now directly faced: "Whether the doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning the necessity of works unto salvation, be a direct denial of the foundation of our faith?" First, if it were so, the Church of Rome would simply cease to be a Christian Church. But Calvin admits that "in the Papacy some Church remaineth,—a Church crazed, or, if you will, broken quite in pieces, forlorn, misshapen, yet some Church;" his reason being, "Antichrist must sit in the temple of God." Philip Mornay du Plessis, a French Protestant, admits the "slender thread" by which Rome holds life. Zanchius acknowledges "the Church of Rome, even at this present day, for a Church of Christ,—such a Church as Israel under Jeroboam, yet a Church;" his reason being that she holds the truth regarding God, and the person of Christ, and confesses Christ as the only Redeemer and coming Judge. But Hooker "reins the question shorter than they do." Let Popish pride, and bloody tyranny, and idolatry, and every error be abjured, this alone remaining, "by Christ alone, without works, we cannot be saved," and it is enough for him to shew that this does not prove a direct denial of the foundation of faith. For works, in this sense, are only an addition to the foundation, not an alteration of the foundation itself. Salvation only by Christ, is the true foundation of Christianity; but does this exclude every sort of addition? What, then, of

faith, of confession, and obedience? We ourselves hold such "additaments of explication." The Romish addition may be, and is, privative, so as to take away the very essence of that to which it is adjoined; still the denial is not direct; in words, somehow, the foundation is still confessed,—as if one should say, our election is of grace for our works' sake, electing grace would be confessed in words, though utterly denied in fact. The works that are added by Rome are better than circumcision; for they are of constant obligation, whereas circumcision is superseded by baptism. And when we say we are justified by faith alone, we do not exclude hope and charity as

"inseparable mates with faith in the man that is justified, or works as necessary duties required at the hands of every justified man; but to shew that faith is the only hand which putteth on Christ unto justification, and Christ the only garment, which being so put on, covereth the shame of our defiled natures, hideth the imperfections of our works, preserveth us blameless in the sight of God, before whom otherwise the very weakness of our faith were cause sufficient to make us culpable, yea, to shut us out from the kingdom of heaven, where nothing that is not absolute can enter."

Christ is alone in our redemption; but to convey the blessing to us there was the eternal election of God, and there is the effectual application in time, and the consummation in glory. Christ is in all these; in Him and by Him we are called, justified, sanctified, glorified, and all by Him alone: "Howbeit, not so by Him alone, as if in us, to our vocation, the hearing of the gospel; to our justification, faith; to our sanctification, the fruits of the Spirit; to our entrance into rest, perseverance in hope, in faith, in holiness, were not necessary." The fault of the Church of Rome is in ascribing to works a power to satisfy God for sin, and to merit grace here and glory in heaven. Still works are "a thing subordinated, builded to the foundation," which is Christ, and, when wrongly added, do not form an addition to the foundation, but to the thing subordinate. The foundation is indeed overthrown by ascribing divine acceptableness to any work "proceeding from the natural freedom of our will," by attaching to works an expiatory and meritorious value,—by congruity to merit vocation; by a second sort to merit the second justification, and by condignity to merit heaven; this is to "pull up the doctrine of faith by the roots." The plain direct denial of the foundation is a necessary conclusion from these

tenets; but then it is a conclusion, an inference, not in itself a direct avouchment. Again, there are various sorts of heresies, all of which may alike overthrow the foundation, but not all with the same obviousness to popular apprehension. The Romish heresy about works is of the sort that admits of the less instructed holding it, and yet readily granting and maintaining the true foundation. That, in this reasoning, Hooker may not be suspected of seeking to varnish Romish tenets, he declares:

"Since I began thoroughly to understand their meaning, I have found their halting in this doctrine greater than perhaps it seemeth to them which know not the deepness of Satan, as the blessed Divine speaketh." "The Church of Rome is an adversary unto Christ's merits," although she "acknowledges that we have received the power of meriting by the blood of Christ." The Popish notion of grace is totally different from his. "By grace they confess; but by grace in such sort, that as many as wear the diadem of bliss, they wear nothing but what they have won."

Lest it should be supposed that this long argument, with all these admissions, is, after all, but a wearisome iteration of a verbal quibble, a mere airy line between *direct* and *indirect*, Hooker now claims a full verdict in his favour with regard to his original assertion, on the ground of this distinction. Here there occurs a remarkable passage. It presents a characteristic picture of the man, both in his strength and in his weakness, and of his peculiar art of persuasion. He has seemed to grant the total contrariety between salvation by grace and salvation by human merit, in whatever way that merit may be derived, or under whatever name it may pass. You lay aside all suspicion, you drop your guard. At that moment comes the thrust. It is delivered so quickly, and the rapier is so keen, that you scarcely feel it. But it is presently followed by a warm and persistent attack that demands all your vigilance and skill. Grace is grace, and works are works, "howbeit" many saints, martyrs, and ancient fathers "have had their sundry perilous opinions," and amongst them this, "that they hoped to make God some part of amends for their sins by the voluntary punishments which they laid upon themselves;" and shall we place upon their graves the deadly epitaph of damnation? If error is always damning, who can hope to be saved? Then, kindling and gathering all his force,

he refuses to exclude any, be he pope or cardinal, from the benefit of this hope; for in this matter there is no difference between them "and John a Style."

"Give me a man, of what estate or condition soever, yea, a cardinal or a pope, whom at the extreme point of his life affliction hath made to know himself; whose heart God hath touched with true sorrow for all his sins, and filled with love toward the Gospel of Christ; whose eyes are opened to see the truth, and his mouth to renounce all heresy and error any way opposite thereunto, this one opinion of merit excepted, which he thinketh God will require at his hands, and because he wanteth, therefore trembleth and is discouraged; it may be I am forgetful, or unskilful, not furnished with things new and old, as a wise and learned scribe should be, nor able to allege that, whereunto, if it were alleged, he doth bear a mind most willing to yield, and so to be recalled, as well from this as from other errors: and shall I think, because of this only error, that such a man toucheth not so much as the hem of Christ's garment?"

The case is put in the most favourable light, and the poor Papist is presented again and again as having all the virtues and graces of the Spirit, with only this infinitesimal defect, that he is in darkness as to the complete freeness of saving grace, so that he is troubled with "a little too much dejection, somewhat too great a fear." Then comes the climax:

"Let me die, if ever it be proved, that simply an error doth exclude a pope or a cardinal, in such a case, utterly from hope of life. Surely, I must confess unto you, if it be an error to think that God may be merciful to save men even when they err, my greatest comfort is my error; were it not for the love I bear unto this error, I would neither wish to speak nor to live."

Finally, he claims the support of Paul in what he said of himself in the same circumstances,—"I obtained mercy, for I did it ignorantly." And the sermon concludes with a warning to Roman Catholics against presuming on the mercy of God towards their fathers in the times of darkness,—"Christ hath spoken too much unto you, for you to claim the privilege of your fathers," and with an exhortation to the Temple congregation in behalf of peace and charity.

We have been thus minute in presenting the substance of this celebrated sermon, or rather treatise, because it gives so lively a picture of Hooker, and because the discussion is in itself profoundly interesting and useful. Hooker appears here as holding out a hand to all the great religious parties. The Calvinistic Protestant finds a minutely orthodox statement of

the most fundamental question between him and Rome—justification by faith alone through the imputed righteousness of Christ; and the evangelical Christian meets with passages that bear the genuine savour of gospel life. The Romanist is pleased to find a Protestant so bent on abating the rigour of Protestant denunciation, and thinks he shall know how to avail himself of not a few admissions, oblique as they are. The Rationalist rejoices in the broad charity which makes the pale of salvation so wide, and stands up so stoutly and with such warmth against the bigotry that would affix damnation to honest doubt or error. But not one of them can claim Hooker wholly. They would gladly welcome a champion of such skill and power, but without the most pitiful disingenuousness they dare not. He has a dramatic power of identifying himself for the time with most diverse systems and habits of thought and feeling; but then it is only for the time. And the great marvel is by what magic he can weave together such different materials into a garment in which he is himself to live.

It is a painful but most necessary and wholesome question that is debated. The existence of scepticism in all its forms, and, amongst others, that which denies the reality of a final and irremediable perdition of souls, has doubtless a designed compensating advantage in its effects upon Christian life. It deepens and quickens spiritual sensibility, adds clearness and power to Christian belief, and arouses believers to the urgency of their obligations as witnesses and preachers of saving truth to a perishing world. There is a spurious sensibility, no doubt, which, rather than allow itself to be disturbed in its luxurious self-indulgence, will deny the plainest dictates of Scripture, deride the alarms of conscience, ignore the warnings of Providence, trifle with the glory of the Supreme Ruler, and recklessly hazard the last welfare of men's souls. Though less coarse in appearance, it is as thoroughly selfish as the most sensual voluptuousness. But there is also a drowsy sensibility which permits Christians to rest in the holding of a faultless creed, with an easy admission of the awfulness of its truths, but without a corresponding zeal in proclaiming them to the world. The true counterpart to the prevalence of scepticism, and its only sure antidote, is the revival of the Church,—its awakening to a more adequate sense of the truths which it

professes, an increased sanctity of life, and far more abundant prayer and effort for men's salvation.

Every token of saving faith and true spiritual life in Roman Catholics, whether in past or present times, will be welcomed and garnered by right-minded Protestants with joy and thanksgiving. But that there have been and are such Roman Catholics, must not blind us to the fact that the Romish system has no tendency to produce them, and gives them no welcome when they appear. It is the worst enemy of the human race. It is the mother alike of superstition and infidelity, those twin forms of human degradation and ruin. It is the corrupter of every truth of God, the foe of every interest of Christ, the seducer and betrayer and tyrant of mankind. Our estimate of Hooker is not raised when we find him employing his great gifts, not in exposing the perils of such a system, but rather in hiding them; and our only consolation is in the perception of the poverty and weakness of the arguments by which alone that object can be advanced.

(1) How manifestly opposed to historical truth is the statement, that Popish practice may be divorced from faith in Popish dogmas in those who have been born and bred in that community, or that the practice is less grossly corrupt than the dogmas? The exact contrary is the fact. The practice went before the dogma, and was its root and mother, and is always worse. The dogma is little else than an ecclesiastical decree, for the purpose of securing uniformity in the practice, and defending it from disturbance; or a theological statement, with the design of giving the practice an appearance of consistency with scripture and reason. The range of invention in false religions is for the most part limited to fanciful details and plausible explanations, the fundamental principles being already provided in corrupt natural tendencies which are the same everywhere. It is the pride of man that suggests the various schemes of self-righteousness; and the doctrines of human ability for virtuous action as in the sight of God, of expiations which men may render for sin, of the superfluous and transferable merit they may acquire by extraordinary efforts, of a purgatory instead of heaven, of the worship of saints and angels and of relics and holy places, of priestly powers for the magical effects of external rites, and the whole apparatus of superstition, have their original source and find their con-

genial home in "the carnal mind," which "is enmity against God."

(2.) Hooker's doctrine of repentance is directly opposed to his own doctrine of faith, and indeed to the whole scheme of justification by the merits of Christ. The mingling of human merits with Christ's in the supreme matter of satisfying eternal justice, he places among the sins of oversight that are covered by a general repentance. Repentance is thus dissociated from faith, on which it ought to rest, and made the critical turning point of divine acceptance. It is most painful to find Hooker thus overthrowing his own express and ample statements regarding the only standing-ground of a sinner before God.

(3.) The plea of ignorance unquestionably goes far, but not so far as Hooker would carry it. It will avail for weak faith, but not for essential unbelief. In his hands it necessarily leads —if those who sin against the Holy Ghost be excepted—to universal salvation. For, if ignorance of this vital truth of the gospel be safe, where is the limit to be placed? This remark applies to Hooker's classification of heresies in respect of culpability and danger; he gives no adequate reason, with the exception above noted, why they should not all be placed on the same footing as mere pardonable errors. And the use he makes of 1 Tim. i. 13, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly, and in unbelief," is obviously fallacious. The apostle in his humility has been describing his criminality as a persecutor and blasphemer of Christ; the only limit to its enormity being that it did not make his salvation absolutely impossible, —he had not sinned the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. And the "mercy" which he "obtained" was conversion to the faith during his earthly life, by which faith he stood in the righteousness of Christ, utterly abjuring his own. His case as a sinner was the same with that of all his countrymen, if we except perhaps Caiaphas; but did they all like him obtain mercy? "And now, brethren," says Peter, "I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers." But with regard to that very sin of ignorance, they must "repent and be converted," and they are warned that "every soul which will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people" (Acts iii. 17, 19, 23). God forbid that we should abandon the hope that many a poor Papist, even in the darkest times, overlaid and perverted as the truth of Christ is in the Romish system, should not have been so moved and guided by the

Spirit of grace as to come to a true sense of guilt, and, while still in some measure using Romish language and practising Romish customs, led to place his real trust in Christ alone, renouncing and hating every other plea at the bar of the infinite and unalterable Righteousness. But this is entirely different from the position of Hooker, who makes ignorance take the place of faith, or rather the place of the righteousness of Christ as the basis of divine acceptance and pardon.

(4.) The entire argument on which Hooker spends so much toil and ingenuity, with regard to the difference between a direct and a constructive denial of the foundation of faith, appears to be not only irrelevant, but even hostile to his case. For the question is about the likelihood of salvation in the Church of Rome; and if, at least consequentially, that system —to use his own language—"pulls up by the roots the doctrines of faith," "plainly overthrows the foundation of faith, and extinguishes the force of the blood of Christ," what matters it though the truth be not denied directly and in so many words? It is the virtual, the practical effect of the system that is in question. And is it not all the more ruinous from this very deception? Are not men only the more effectually retained in its deadly errors by this occasional, fragmentary, and superficial use of scriptural and evangelical terms?

(5.) Nothing needs be said with regard to the finessing about the expression "by Christ alone," when he takes the trouble to tell us that this does not exclude God's election of the redeemed in eternity, or the Spirit's application of redemption in time. This is one of those cases in which Hooker seems to play with the understandings of his readers. It is rather worse here, for it is trifling with the most glorious work of God and the most precious hope of sinners—the provision of a meritorious satisfaction for sin in Christ and His death. In like manner, the "additament" to the foundation, which does not alter the foundation, needs no exposure. Hooker himself has properly said that the Romish system of works changes "the very essence of the remedy."

(6.) The question whether the Church of Rome is really a Christian church, is not one of great consequence at any time, and in the present case is of no consequence at all; for the possibility of salvation for men who are more or less connected with it is willingly admitted, and the affirmation of its being a Christian church can carry us no farther. But Hooker incurs

a serious charge by importing this question into the present discussion; for he is exalting the idea of the visible church beyond its true dimensions; and, while trying to increase the probability of salvation within the pale of Rome, he is making it increasingly difficult to defend the Reformation from the charge of schism. Another step in the course of error follows; for if the Protestant separation from Rome be justifiable while its corruptions were so innocuous as is suggested, the idea of a visible church as a divine institution, and therefore demanding the most sedulous care in framing its polity and administering its government in accordance with all that is known of the divine will regarding it,—such a conception of the church is well-nigh overturned. We may play fast and loose with it as may suit the requirements of a shifting expediency. The visible church is a divine instrument for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, for the ingathering and edification of His people in this world. It is not essential to salvation to be living in connection with it, for the case is easily conceivable of one improperly cut off from its communion (unless we hold its administration to be infallible), and therefore still in full communion with Christ and His true body. But as a divine instrument, of vast importance for the Redeemer's glory and the good of His people, not the slightest intimation of His will regarding its structure and administration is to be disregarded or lightly tampered with. Here, therefore, we cannot but see the disintegration already at work and far advanced in Hooker's views, which was afterwards fully developed in the heterogeneous structure of his "Ecclesiastical Polity."

(7.) A word remains to be said regarding the treatment of the Galatian circumcision. In the first place, it is not a case in point; it was manifestly a case of transition from truth to error; some were infected, but not all, and those who were might yet be cured. Hence the tenderness that mingles with the apostle's indignation. Doubtless there was this resemblance to the case of Papists, that some gospel terms were still used by those who were really changing the foundation of faith. That it was a less defensible case is quite untenable. Circumcision had been a divine institution, and was still permitted to Jewish Christians in the transition from the old economy to the new. It was not an arbitrary invention, like so many of the Romish rites and usages; but if adopted by Gentile Christians, it could only mean a thing essential to salvation,

and claiming a place along with Christ's death in the meritorious standing of a sinner before God. Hence the broad unhesitating denunciation of the Apostle, so different from the attenuated subtleties of Hooker:—"If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace."

Our limits do not admit of any detailed notice of the remaining sermon on "The Nature of Pride." It is given by Mr Keble in a greatly enlarged form as compared with previous editions,—for which additions he is indebted to the Dublin University Library. From its length, and the variety of its contents, it would seem to be rather a collection of discourses than one only. It presents the same forms of doctrine as have been already described, but is free from such questionable positions as are found in the other Temple Sermons. There are tokens of an increased or more open hostility to the Puritans, and some interesting anticipations of the leading principles of the "Ecclesiastical Polity." It is marked by a frequent loftiness and strength of thought, and a copious and stately eloquence, which make us feel the full force of Owen's regret, that the main relic of Hooker's genius, and of his mental toil and learned accumulations, should be a controversial work against such a party as the Puritans. Never surely was there a sadder instance of "giving up to party what was meant for mankind."

JAMES MURDOCH.

---

## ART. V.—*Reorganisation of the Prussian Evangelical Church.*

THERE is at present much controversy respecting the new Prussian Church laws—the so-called "Falk" laws. These the Roman Catholics resent as an outrage upon their liberty; but they cannot be deemed excessively onerous, and they are certainly impartial, because they apply in precisely the same sense, and with strict equality, to the national Protestant Church, as well as to the Roman Catholic Church. If a Protestant Government only enforces the same measures

against the Roman Catholics as against its own national Church, it is not probable that either injustice or real hardship is imposed on the former. And the fact, that the Protestant Church accepts these measures as needful to the wellbeing and security of the State, will make the British public suspect the true meaning of the Romish outcry against them. Amidst, however, the din of this controversy, other changes are silently being enacted in the Protestant Church of Prussia which, though apt to be overlooked, cannot fail to effect great results in Germany—changing the whole aspect and destiny of Protestantism in that country, and which must have special interest for our readers. The eight old provinces of the Prussian kingdom are being drawn together under one Church constitution, whose principle is essentially Presbyterian. And the first step in this great organic reconstruction of the Prussian Evangelical Church has been taken, in the organisation throughout the six eastern provinces (thus assimilating them to the two western provinces of Rhineland and Westphalia) of each evangelical congregation or community *(Gemeinde)*, and its election at once of a representative body of its members, and of a session, composed of the pastor and elders. On this wide and firmly-organised basis, presbyteries *(Kreis-Synoden)* and synods for each province are to be established; and finally, a general synod of the whole Church is to be convened as soon as possible, where the final arrangements for the government of this national Church will be determined upon. We propose briefly to describe the antecedents of these great phenomena, viz., the organisation of a Free, Protestant, and Presbyterian Church in Europe, with the severance of the bonds that have hitherto linked the most theocratic State to the most bureaucratic Protestant Church in Europe; as also to describe the specific enactments which are now bringing these events to pass.

It is not sufficiently known that Luther, in proclaiming the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, not only denounced and destroyed the superstitious claims of Rome's exclusive priesthood, and the hierarchical distinctions of the Roman orders, but also asserted and established the rights of the universal lay membership of the Church. These rights, he said, were to be exercised by each congregation or community, but in an orderly manner, so as to secure the preaching of God's Word, the pure administration of the sacraments,

and the fulfilment of the mutual services of Christian fellowship.[1]

The stormy confusion and feverish excitement of that epoch, leading to the Anabaptist excesses and the Peasants' War, hindered the adequate recognition of that principle of communal or congregational rights, and the consequent organisation of the "congregation" in the Lutheran Churches of the Reformation. And the pressure of events compelled these Churches to preserve, and even to rivet more firmly, that relation with the State authorities of their respective countries, which was, under varying form, the universal tradition and usage of the mediæval Church. It is impossible to understand the growth of our national Protestant Churches, and more especially of the excessive "territorialism" or abject State-dependence of the Prussian Church, without reviewing the circumstances leading to this close relationship between Church and State at the period of the Reformation, especially

[1] Luther, in his Address to the Christian Nobles of the German Nation, says: "Denn all Christen sind wahrhaftes geistlichen standes, und ist unter ihnen kein unterschied, denn des amts halber allein, wie Paulus, 1 Cor. 12 ch. sagt; dass wir allesammt ein Körper sind, doch ein jeglich Glied sein eignen Werk hat, damit es dem andern dient Das macht Alles, dass wir Eine Taufe, Ein Evangelium, Einen Glauben haben, und sind gleiche Christen, denn die Taufe, Evangelium und Glauben—die machen allein Geistlich und Christenvolk." ["For all Christians are properly of the spiritual and clerical order, and there is no difference between them, save in the office they hold: as St Paul says (1 Cor xii.), that we are all one body, yet that each member has its own office, that it may serve the other. All lies here, that we have one baptism, one gospel, one faith, and are equally Christians; for baptism, the gospel, and faith, these alone make us spiritual, and people of Christ."][1] Yet Luther says: "Was gemein ist mag Niemand ohne der Gemeinde Willen an sich nehmen. Darum soll ein jeder der ein Christ sein will gewiss seyn und bei sich wohl erwägen dass wir alle zugleich Priesten sind, d. i. dass wir gleiche Gewalt an dem Worte Gottes und jedem Sacramente haben; doch gebühre es einem Jeden sich derselbigen nicht zu gebrauchen, denn allein aus Verwilligungder Gemeinde oder Beruf der Oberen, denn was aller insgemein ist, kann Niemand insonderneit an sich zieben, bis er dazu berufen ist."[2] ["What is common to all, no one can take upon himself, without the will and command of the community. Let every one who means to be a Christian be assured, and let him ponder the truth, that we are all alike priests,—*i. e.* that we have equal power with respect to the word of God and every sacrament: yet is not, therefore, the duty of each to use that power; for no one can, without the consent of the community or the commission of its rulers, appropriate especially to himself what is common to all."]

1 Cf. Köstlin, "Luther's Doctrine of the Church," vol. i. pp. 316, 326.
2 Von der Babyl. Gefangenschaft.

in Germany. Guizot has named four causes[1] which secured to the laity, even when excluded from any direct spiritual authority, influence in the administration of church affairs. Two of these, the rights of patronage and of the "*Vogtei*," or temporal defendership, were chiefly vested throughout all Catholic countries in the kings or princes of each land. More important, however, than these, was the sentiment which arose, in a sense, from the Catholic conception of a Christian State, namely, that it was a State the whole of whose citizens were by the acts of baptism and confirmation made Christians, and thus members of the church. Merely as members of the church, neither individually nor in their separate congregations, did they exercise any rights. These were gradually taken away from them. But as members of the church *and* citizens of a Christian State, their rights in the church were still represented and maintained by their national rulers. Sir James Stephen says with perfect truth:[2]

"The Court of Rome began by degrees to exclude the laity from any share in the election of bishops, and to confine them wholly to the clergy, which at length was wholly effected: *this mere form of election appearing to the people to be a thing of small consequence, while the crown was in possession of an absolute negative which was almost equivalent to a direct right of nomination.*"

The king was thus the guardian and the administrator of the rights of his people, who constituted the entire membership of the church, in his dealings with Rome, and in his control of the clergy and of church property. It was on this ground that the three estates of the English realm, as Representatives of the people who formed the church of this country, and who therefore rightly held all the rights and owned all the property of the church, carried through the English Reformation. In the German empire, however, the peculiar relations of the empire and the papacy gave special emphasis to this position of the civil rulers:

"In nature and compass, the government of these two potentates—the pope and the emperor—is the same, differing only in the sphere of its working. . . . Opposition between two servants of the same King is inconceivable, each being bound to aid and foster the other; the co-operation of both being needed in all that concerns the welfare of Christendom at large."[3]

---

[1] "History of Civilisation," vol. ii. pp. 37–43. (Bohn's edition.)

[2] In his "Commentaries of the Laws of England," vol. iii. p. 6.

[3] "The Holy Roman Empire," by James Bryce, D.C.L. 3d edition, p. 107.

According to this theory—which gave the *organised* life of a Christian people two heads or rulers, but at the same time gave these two ruling powers mutual relations to one another—the people had a safeguard of their national interests and of their personal freedom against a Papal Episcopate in their national ruler, whilst he at the same time maintained and enforced the spiritual authority and discipline of the church. Now, in the Religious Peace of 1555, the Emperor conceded to the Electoral Princes who had joined the Reformation the liberty to adopt the Augsburg Confession, and to alter the public ordinances and the constitution of the church in their respective lands. This authority devolved, from the Empire on the reforming Princes of its Electoral Diet; and thus the mediæval conception of a State enforcing religious laws, and regulating religious ordinances, was transferred to the Protestant Church. From the very circumstances of the case, the old popular idea, that these supreme ecclesiastical privileges belonged to the national ruler as the head and representative of a Christian people and church, was brought prominently into view; since these princes sought and obtained this concession from the empire, not because they themselves had become Lutherans, but because their peoples had. Nevertheless, it was under this privilege conceded to their princes, and by their acceptance of the creed and church-order which their princes approved, that the peoples of the Reformation obtained peace. The old imperial rights became thus the foundations of the modern State churches of the continent.

Other reasons combined with the necessities of the times to exalt the authority and extend the direct action of the State in the domain of the church. The German reformers threw their whole soul into the work of reforming corrupt Roman doctrine. In their immense labours to awaken and purify the religious life of the people, and to relume the spiritual glory of Christianity, they gave less heed to the inferior questions of church polity,[1] and allowed, under the urgency of a tempes-

[1] King Frederick William IV., in one of the two remarkable documents he published in 1845, puts this forcibly:—"The Reformation in Germany found the churches converted into bishoprics, the bishoprics into imperial provinces, and the bishops into mighty territorial princes—verily, the worst princes of the Imperial Diet. They found the clergy, who had been originally appointed by the bishops as under-bishops and helpers, degraded into serfs of the bishops; and 'the Diaconate' converted into a mere ceremonial introduction to the priesthood, without the least trace

tuous and critical epoch, arrangements to be made for the present order and defence of the reformed churches, which they never sanctioned as scriptural and authoritative, or meant to be permanent. By that upheaval of the old mediæval world, in which the public and social life of the people had been so minutely interlaced and organised by the combined and interacting forces of two ruling powers—the Church and State, we can understand how the whole fabric of society was racked and rent. We also understand how, in the confusion and overthrow of its former religious institutions, society clung and organised itself, in its religious as well as its civil polity, around the *one* factor of authority, with which it was familiar, and which survived the terrific convulsion: and this became almost a necessity when their new religious faith and their freedom to establish religious ordinances in conformity with their faith, had to be defended by the armed power of their rulers, or were only tolerated by their indulgence. Those princes who headed the Reformation were the most eminent members of the newly-formed churches, and by this position they were authorised, it was felt, not only to defend them abroad, but to maintain them at home, and to this end to administer their affairs so as most effectually to secure their prosperity. For Protestantism had introduced a new doctrine of the civil magistracy. According to Rome, the State was of itself, till it was consecrated by alliance with, and obedience to, the church, profane and evil. It was the ruling power of the "*sæculum*," or world. But Protestantism, both in the Lutheran and Reformed churches, conceived the civil magistracy as ordained of

of its original purpose in the church. And finally, they found the people wholly outside the church, and without any voice in its affairs. But they found what was a thousand times worse than that;—they found the Christian faith yet more corrupted, and more unlike its Divine original, than the Church. The Reformers, accordingly, thanks to God, did not think of themselves, but, with undivided energy, inspired and blessed by God, devoted themselves to what was of paramount concern. They raised and purified the faith of the apostles from the grave of its concealment and corruptions. What properly related to the Church was a secondary matter,—must, indeed, in this vast struggle for life and death, be of necessity a secondary matter." "Accordingly," continues Professor Richter, who has so faithfully exhibited the views of his monarch and friend, "the Reformers only devised provisional arrangements in the Church, but these provisional arrangements have become permanent, and reverence for the Reformation has erroneously led men to seek authority for them in the Holy Scriptures."—"*King F. Wilhelm IV. und die Verfassung der Evangelischen Kirche.*" Von Ludwig Richter. (Berlin, 1861. P. 54.)

God, as entrusted with "the sword" for the maintenance of His divine order and law, and thus authorised to control every realm of life, save that which was under the immediate government of the ruling officers of the church. A theocratic doctrine runs through the writings of all the reformers,—of Zwingle, as much as, of Calvin and Luther.

In Germany, however, there was another cause of this ascendancy of the State over the Church, stronger and more operative than any we have named. The State received the episcopal regency of the Church into its hands. The King of Prussia is the *Summus Episcopus* of the Prussian Church. In every German country the Head of the State, be he emperor, king, or duke—Roman Catholic or Protestant, is the *Summus Episcopus* of the Protestant Church in his country, and as such, has full legislative and administrative rights over that Church.[1] According to the old doctrine of "the three estates" in the Church *(politicus, ecclesiasticus, œconomicus* —the governmental, the pastoral, the popular), the *bishops* held the government of the Church *(potestas jurisdictionis)*; the *priesthood* administered the means of grace in the Church (they had the *potestas ordinis*—the right of administering the doctrine and the sacraments of the Church); and the *people*, who were the third estate, were disfranchised, and had no place or *potestas* in the Church, save what was conceded to their representatives in the State.

Now the Lutheran Churches maintained the second estate of the Church—the clergy—and whilst denying them any sacerdotal pre-eminency, honoured their office as pre-eminently the "teaching" office of the Church. They likewise restored the third "estate" of the Church, by re-organising the community or congregation, and investing it with distinct and important privileges. But the first estate of the Church, its supreme authority and direction, that which in the Roman Catholic Church was found in the episcopate, had no definite place in the organisation of the Lutheran Church, and was accordingly transferred to the Head of the State.

In Prussia, accordingly, as in other German countries, since

[1] Roman Catholic princes govern the Protestant Church in their countries by means of consistories, composed wholly of Protestant members, lay and clerical, whom they appoint; but this arrangement is a political concession, and is not grounded on any constitutional or ecclesiastical law.

the sixteenth century, the government of the Church has been vested in the ruling prince of each country; though the universal honour entertained for the clerical office in the Church has required that leading members of the clergy be consulted in all Church matters, and they mainly compose his official staff in his administration of the Church; and though the remains of the "communal" or congregational liberties of the Church have survived in greater or less degree.[1]

As may be inferred from the origin of State Churches in Germany which we have described, the government of the Church by the Head of the State was not regarded as being properly included in, or derived from, his civil authority: it was, as Richter[2] says, an "annexum" to it, which was therefore to be conducted by the king according to the distinctive principles of the Church, and with the help of church-boards and church-officers. Accordingly, in all Lutheran countries the administration of the Church has been conducted (1.) by consistories,—public bodies whose authority extended over a whole province, and which, though appointed by the ruling prince, were composed of clergy and others whose sympathy with the Church, as well as their administrative ability, were approved;[3]

[1] Each congregation (*Gemeinde*) was by the first German Reformers summoned to exercise its rights in the choice of the pastor, and in the exercise of discipline. The control of Church property was also in part committed to its care: all parochial affairs were submitted to it, and it had the charge of its own poor. But this conception of the *Gemeinde* which was maintained in the Reformed Churches, gradually passed away from the Lutheran Churches. Church discipline was transferred, even in the sixteenth century, to the "consistories" appointed by the ruling prince; the right of the choice of a pastor was reduced to the right of raising an objection to a candidate, which had to be sustained before the consistory; and the existence of the *Gemeinde* was made self-conscious chiefly on the occasion of the raising of any church taxes. Accordingly the *Gemeinde* in the Lutheran churches had, until this century, no organisation or government of its own. When it acted under the direction of a consistory, it was through a meeting of all the householders. There are some remarkable exceptions to this rule. *E.g.* in Kur-Hessen—Sessions or Presbyteries date back to 1539, which were formed in each *Gemeinde* for the maintenance of church discipline; and in Würtemberg, *Kirchen Convente* (Church sessions) were introduced in 1649, at the instance of Valentin Andrea.

[2] In his famous "Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts," vol. ii. p. 418.

[3] When consistories were first formed (the first was formed in Wittemberg, 1542, on the ground of a recommendation of the Reformers, 1539), as the highest spiritual court for the maintenance of oversight, discipline, and jurisdiction in the Church, their duties were defined: (1.) as to *administration*. They included the oversight of teaching and worship, and of the public duties and personal character of the clergy, the trial of candidates for the ministry, the

and (2.) by superintendents for smaller districts, who were always clergymen appointed by the State, and who acted usually under the cognisance and authority of the consistory in maintaining an oversight of the clergy and of the communities, as well as of the property of the Church. Generally, however, the highest functions of power (the so-called *jura reservata*, in distinction from the *jura vicaria*, which were committed to the consistories), viz., legislation, the appointment of officers, dispensations, &c., were exercised by the Head of the State, who fulfilled these duties, incumbent upon him as Head of the Church, and who determined finally all appeals to himself from consistories, by means of high political functionaries;—of late years, either by the minister of the interior, or by a special "minister of worship and education." And gradually, during the scholastic barrenness of the seventeenth century, and the rationalism of the eighteenth century, the "territorial" system, as it is named, by which the Church was regarded as only a department of the State, having no separate ground of existence, no independent organism, and no specific code of law, tyrannised more and more over the Church. The consistories, becoming properly State-boards, were called to fulfil purely civil functions on the one hand, and, on the other, ceased to exercise any important functions of a spiritual or disciplinary character. And in Prussia, for a few years at least, during the commencement of this century (1808–1817), they were wholly abolished, and their functions were entirely fulfilled by civil officers. Church-life among the people was stricken at its very roots by this fatal policy: and "Police Christianity" was the name by which the religion of Christ manifested in the Church was at once described and stigmatised.

The late King Frederick William thus pourtrays and laments this overgrown paralytic territorialism which had supplanted the freer organisations of the early Reformed

institution and ordination of ministers, the management of church property, and certain dispensations, *e. g.* baptism and marriage in a private house, marriage within the forbidden degrees, &c.; (2.) as to *jurisdiction*. At first this was confined merely to marriage and to church discipline; but even in the sixteenth century, the consistories claimed judicial rights over the church property, patronage, the civil position of the clergy, as well as the power in certain cases to inflict punishment. Most of these functions gradually lapsed. Discipline ceased to be enforced. All jurisdiction passed over to the civil courts, and consequently the duties of the consistories were confined to purely internal and official arrangements of the Church, *e. g.* the examination of candidates, and installation of ministers, &c.

Churches, and which had wholly destroyed the spiritual activity and even the very consciousness of the Church:

"The territorial system has arrived with us at its very extreme limit of development, and has been incarnated in very flesh and blood in our official class. The episcopate of the king is indeed acknowledged by the legislature, but only as a rhetorical phrase to express his absolute sovereignty over the Church. Our kings were, previous to the Union (viz., 1817), although strictly attached to the Reformed Church, as much the ruling bishops of the Lutheran National Church as they are now of the United Evangelical Church. Even the catholic princes of Germany are the ruling bishops over their evangelical national Churches just as our kings are here; and if they put any limit on the exercise of their episcopal rights, this is done solely as an indulgence, and from expediency, not as a matter of right. Now, the territorial system and the episcopate of the head of the State are both of such a nature, that one alone would be quite sufficient to destroy the Church, if it were mortal. The conditions of the Church, which proceed from such a system, may be recognised from the very titles of our so-called Church-boards. There is the King's Minister, with the King's 'Ober-Consistorialräthe;' further, the King's Consistories in the provinces, with the King's General Superintendents and the King's Consistorialräthe; and, finally, the King's Superintendents. And, verily, our history within the last forty years has given us practical proof how significant and effective is the 'kingly' title in these designations, and how idle it is to call them Church-boards. For, in the year 1808, all consistories, both upper and lower, were swept away; and, until some considerable time after our War of Deliverance, our evangelical Church existed without even the breath of one single Church institution or authority. The Government transacted all the former business of the consistories. When the late king saw the impropriety of this state of things, royal consistories were again established, though with different functions than before. What is the conclusion I draw? If the presbyteries of the Reformed Church or the bishoprics of the Romish Church were swept away, by that very act these Churches would be themselves dissolved. With us, on the contrary, the abolition of all manifest Church authorities, and then their partial restoration with different functions, could take place without the 'Church' being in any way affected by the procedure,—a certain proof that the Church, as a self-conscious and independent corporation, had already been long dead." Again he continues: "What is a Church? Unhappy age, when even a child does not know that! but what an age is ours, when scarcely one of a million German Protestants know it! Some twenty-eight years ago, there lay an appeal in the Ministers' bureau concerning a refusal of baptism. One minister said, 'The Church desires it.' Another replied, 'What is the Church? A white house, with a red roof and a spire, what can it desire?' Let us ask a Lutheran—a Lutheran theologian—where is the real existence of the Church? Wherein is its unity represented? We must wait in vain for an answer. For to name something that oscillates between the clerical office, the lesser or greater synod, the consistorium, the minister of worship, and the ruling prince, is certainly not to give an answer. The 'Reformed' can give us an

answer, if they trouble themselves about the Church, which is rarely the case. For with the 'Reformed,' one town always forms one Church; and in most 'Reformed' countries the proper pastoral relationship exists, as it does not among the Lutherans and the Catholics." . . . "I see no help for German Christendom save in the formation of churches. Yes, churches! For that is the one thing the Church needs, that it may become and continue a 'Church.' Yes, churches! That is my watch-word—my loud, crying appeal to the Church of Germany, which needs churches. They are the sole condition of life for the Church."[1]

Despite, however, this mournful plaint of the late Prussian king, the malign spell of territorialism at the very time he wrote was already loosening its hold of the German Church. And his earnest remonstrances both quickened its aspirations after greater freedom, and aided its enfranchisement. The *nadir* of the Church's degradation and bondage to the State was reached when the Prussian consistories were abolished in 1808, and Church affairs were wholly managed by State officials. Ever since that date there has been an upward movement, which has lately sprung, as a surprise,—like the dawn, upon those who had not watched its many quivering foretokens.

The religious life of the Germans was profoundly affected by the fearful struggles and trials of the great Napoleonic Wars. The War of Deliverance, as the closing war of the series is styled, saw Germany not only freed from foreign French oppression, but from her own frigid and sciolistic infidelity. She then arose mighty with new born strength, as a giant awakening from a long slumber. New tides of living energy swept through every realm of activity in her many-membered lands, and she began to enter on the position she has so proudly claimed and won in Europe. Religion led and shared this great revival, and the longings after a nobler and freer church-life which then awoke have possessed the people and reformed the Church in every German land.

We can only review the stages of this development as it is to be seen in Prussia, although it has been witnessed in a greater or less degree throughout all Germany. In Prussia, even the dissolution of the consistories in 1808 was largely caused by the discontent with their slavish bureaucracy,—dishonouring and caricaturing their so-called Church original and their independent authority. In that very year Schleiermacher, whose name is pre-eminently associated with the religious revival of that period, drew up for the king a sketch of a

[1] Quoted from the two Treatises of the King, written in 1845.

Church constitution which foreshadows much that is being now enacted. In 1817, Frederick William III., by a *cabinet order*, founded the United Evangelical Church of Prussia, gathering into one Church the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions. In his cabinet order, he says that "he wished through the Union, as a continuation of the immortal work of the Reformation, to raise up a newly-inspired Evangelical Church," grounded on the essential truths of Christianity, and animated by the spirit of love for all holding these truths. The new arrangements for accomplishing this union, which were completed by the publication of the "Agende" for public worship in 1821, created immense discussion and activity, which, although they led to some dissension, and even to the separation of an old-Lutheran party, brought back the Church to the consciousness of its life, its true unity in the faith, and its relations to the German nation. In 1835, the Churches of the two western provinces of Prussia—Rhineland and Westphalia—the different sections of which had inherited most various forms of Church government, though mostly of a Presbyterian type, received a harmonious and definitive constitution. Each *gemeinde* or congregation was organised, with its ruling presbytery or session, composed of pastors, elders, and deacons, and all of them were united together in the provincial synods. This Presbyterian organisation was mixed to some extent with the Consistorial, as two consistories still represented in the two provinces the rights of the Prussian monarch; but still it compacted the Protestant Churches of these provinces into a living unity, and evoked the healthful and zealous activity of the laity in Church affairs. The example of these western provinces fostered and spurred the desire of the six eastern provinces of Prussia for a like organisation and freedom. To meet this desire, and to prepare cautiously for the vast ecclesiastical changes that would in consequence be enacted, a series of synodal meetings were summoned—first of the district synods in 1843, of provincial synods towards the close of 1844, and of a general synod, whose sessions lasted from 21st June to 28th August 1846. These synods could not, indeed, have any proper representation of the laity of the Church, because the laity were as yet unorganised in their several *gemeinden* or congregations. They were likewise unduly biassed by the official cast of their composition. Nevertheless, they could not but utter the universal feeling of the Church throughout the

country in its demand for organised activity and visible unity. And some of the most important suggestions of the general synod have been adopted by the king in his decree of last September, which at last answers to the need and the prayer of the Church.

Now burst over Germany the Revolution of 1848; and as its result, the modern principle of religious liberty was proclaimed and fixed in the most precise and absolute terms as a fundamental law of the German Empire; whilst most of the Northern German States have definitely accepted it in their several constitutions. The third article of the "Fundamental German Laws," adopted at Frankfort in 1848 by the delegates of all German States, reads thus: "Every religious body manages its own affairs, but remains subject to the public laws of the State." The same principle was adopted as a fundamental law of the Prussian Constitution (5th December 1848), in these terms: "The Evangelical and Roman Catholic Churches, as well as every other religious body, arrange and conduct their own affairs independently, and remain in possession and enjoyment of the institution, charities, and funds, designed for their worship, and their educational and benevolent objects;"—which was amended last year by the addition of the words, "but they remain subject to the laws of the State, and to the lawfully-appointed oversight of the State."

The Roman Catholic Church was prepared at once to take full advantage of this measureless liberty which was allowed to it. The Evangelical Church of the eastern provinces was not; it was yet bound to the State. The king was its ruling bishop, and it was yet chained in bondage to his will. Now, however, having such a commission and inspiration to freedom in the constitutional laws both of the Empire and of Prussia, the question forces itself upon us, What hindered the Church from rising up to assert and use its freedom? There were *three* hindrances.

1. The democratic and revolutionary feeling which broke out in 1848, caused, on the one hand, at once a reaction against popular government in the ruling classes of Prussia, and, on the other, a desire on the part of the people to fashion the new organisation of the Church on a thoroughly democratic basis. King Frederick William IV. somewhat favoured the Presbyterian form of government, because it recognised the rights of the people, and yet gave due place to the three orders of Church ministry,—the pastorate, the eldership, and the deaconate. He would have strengthened the principle of

authority in the Church still more, by establishing what he conceived the apostolic order of "bishops," though only as the chief of the pastoral elders. But he would give no countenance to the democratic and purely civil conceptions of the Church, which made the session, presbytery, provincial and general synod, simply so many stages of a popular representative government. He exclaims in a speech delivered in 1853:

"In the modern presbyterian view, presbyters and deacons lose altogether their character and rights as the ministers and officers of the Church, and are transformed into mere representatives of the people. The old 'reformed' doctrine of Church life and polity is destroyed by this modern view. Even the freedom of the people, and the exercise of their own rights in the 'community,' are absorbed and annihilated by representation."

2. The liberal party in the Prussian *Land-tag*, which was strongly infected by infidelity, has, strange to say, resisted all attempts at any reconstruction of the Church which might enable it to conduct its own affairs. It knew that a church ruled by a minister of State must be lax in discipline, comprehensive and indulgent, and as creedless as his own bureau; whilst an independent church, which exists by its faith, must vigorously maintain that faith.

3. The political controversies and the stupendous conflicts which have absorbed the thoughts and energies of the Prussian people during the last two decades, have diverted the thoughts of the people from the yet ever-conscious and often-muttered exigencies of their church-life.

Notwithstanding these hindrances, something was done. In the year 1850, for the first time in Prussia, the formation of church presbyteries or sessions was allowed and sanctioned by a cabinet order of the king. They were to be composed of the pastors and certain representatives of the congregation. Their formation was to be optional, their duties were most restricted, and the mode of election was vexatious; consequently they were not generally introduced save in the province of Old Prussia. In 1860 such local presbyteries were made imperative, but still their constitution, election, and functions, were inadequate and unsatisfactory. In the same year, 1850, King Frederick William IV. likewise formed an *Ober-Kirchenrath*, or supreme Church Council, composed of a few eminent Church dignitaries and jurists, through which, henceforth, he conducted the purely spiritual affairs of the Church. What, however, related to its property and civil

relationships, and to the intermediate realms of marriage and instruction was still conducted by the Minister of Worship. Further, diocesan synods *(Kreis-Synoden)*, corresponding to our presbyteries, were introduced into the eastern provinces during the years 1861 and 1864; and extraordinary provincial synods were convened in 1869, which recommended the normal establishment of such synods. These preparations have been most effective and valuable in opening the way for the new measures which are now in course of completion.

The peace which followed the rise of a new German empire, and the exaltation of Prussia to its hegemony, allowed expression to the long pent-up desire for a worthier church-life. Prussia had now gained political freedom. She had conquered unity for Germany and supremacy for herself. She was strong and great, but her national Church lay prostrate, broken, and impotent. The contrast was too impressive and sad not to awaken regret, and to inspire effort for the deliverance and honour of the Church. And at last an urgent political emergency gave the final decisive impetus to the King's resolution. The State—both the kingdom and the empire—was confronted with great perils by reason of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. Whilst defending itself, the State must yet act impartially with respect both to its own Protestant, and to the Roman Catholic, Church. In order to do this, it must grant the same independence to the Evangelical Church as the Roman Catholic Church already enjoyed. The State having granted freedom to both alike in the management of their own concerns, can then justly enforce against both equally those laws which are needful to guard its own freedom.

In conclusion, we summarise the ordinances which were published last September, laying the basis of a definite organisation and of constitutional order in the Church of Prussia. It is, however, necessary to premise—*First*, that it is not a complete or an alien and ideal constitution which has been framed and imposed on the Prussian Church. The "Instruction" issued by the *Ober-Kirchenrath* properly observes:

"The new ordinances do not provide a complete constitution for the Church. They rather proceed on the plan of so far supplying the manifest defects of the present constitution, that the Church may be furnished with organs fitted and authorised to co-operate in the manifold task which yet remains of fashioning and developing its common-wealth according to the vital principles of the Evangelical Church."

The present thus grows out of the past, and embodies the formative principles that have lain, though latent, in the Evangelical Church.

*Second.* Though thus imperfect, these ordinances lay surely the foundations of a self-governing and well-organised Church. The lay members of the Church are at last enfranchised. Their place in the Church is secured, and their responsibilities are bound on them. Not only is the local community organised so as to call forth and sustain a public interest in the local affairs of the Church, and to give expression at once to the clear rights and obligations of each member of the community, but in all the higher courts of the Church the laity have equal numbers and influence with the clergy. These lay members of all the higher courts are freely elected by the laity of the congregations which they represent. And further, according to a strictly presbyterian model, whilst districts and provinces retain their several district local courts, so as to avoid the evils of excessive centralisation, there is one general synod in which the provincial and diocesan divisions of the Church are united as living members of one body. The unity of the Evangelical Church is thus realised and manifest.

*Third.* At present, this new constitution of the Church stands side by side with the old consistorial constitution, in which all power of government is derived immediately from the king, and is exercised through consistories in his name. During an epoch of transition, such juxtaposition of two constitutions, and the concurrence of two ruling bodies,—diverse in their originating principles, spirit and method, may be possible. It cannot always continue; and unquestionably the old must give place to the new. In the ordinances of September last, duties are assigned to the synods, diocesan and provincial, which have hitherto devolved on the consistories. The fifteenth article of the Prussian constitution, even as amended last year, as well as the fundamental law of the German empire, both alike declare that the Evangelical Church shall be free to manage its own affairs; and the spirit of this enactment has entered deep into the German mind. We know the difficulty of the complicated problem which arises in the Prussian Church because of the historical relations of the Prussian monarch with that Church, and because of his episcopal and patronal rights. Consistories, indeed, may continue to act in each province, in order to conserve these

legal rights of the king and to maintain an oversight on behalf of the State over the property of the Church, and its general relations with the State: but the express language of the September ordinances, the laws of the Prussian kingdom and of the empire, and the spirit of modern civilisation, guarantee the essential freedom of the Church, when duly organised, to administer its own affairs.

The ordinances relate to, *first*, the organisation of the *Kirchen-gemeinde*;[1] *second*, the constitution of diocesan synods (or presbyteries) and provincial synods; *third*, the convention of a special general synod, to deliberate respecting the constitution and functions of the "General Synod" of the Church, which is to crown the organisation of the Prussian Church.

(1.) The organisation of the *Gemeinde*, or Congregation. This is found in two bodies; *first*, a "Church-Council," composed of the pastor and a body of elders; *second*, a "Representative Council," or, in small congregations, an assembly of the whole membership. The eldership is to be elected by the male members of the congregation, who contribute their legal share to the support of the Church, who are twenty-four years of age, who either are householders or hold a public office or conduct an independent business; and who neither have received public charity during the preceding year, nor have committed any indictable crime, nor have given public offence by their contempt of God's word, or by immorality. On the other hand, all are eligible to the office of "elder," and to the "Representative Council," who have this suffrage, save when they have, through continued absence from public worship and from the sacraments, ceased to express their interest in, and fellowship with, the Church. The elders of the "Church Council" may not be less than four, nor more than twelve, save in exceptional cases; and before entering on office, must during public worship appear before the congregation, and solemnly accept the following vow:

"Do you vow, before God and this congregation, that you will fulfil the office committed to you carefully and loyally, according to the Word of God and the ordinances of the Church and this congregation, and conscientiously strive that everything be done in this community in an orderly and honourable manner, for its good?"

[1] "Parochial community" would best translate this word; but we shall use indifferently the words "community" and "congregation."

The functions of the eldership are thus defined—to support the pastor to the utmost of their power in the religious and moral edification of the community, to promote the Christian activities of the community, and to represent it in the management of its external and internal affairs. The pastor cannot exercise discipline on any member by excluding him from any church office or service, or from the Lord's Supper, without their sanction, or if it be refused, without the sanction of the presbytery. The elders have further to maintain order in public worship, and advise with respect to any changes that are made in it; to take charge of the religious education of the young, and to represent the interests of the Church in the public school; and to act for the community in the care of the poor, the sick, and the outcast. They appoint the inferior officers of the Church, administer its property, and represent the community before the higher Church Courts.

"The Representative Council" of the community is an institution peculiar to Germany. In the Rhenish provinces, in Hanover, and in Baden it has been in existence for years. Its purpose is to give the community a firmer cohesion, a fuller participation in the conduct of its affairs, and a closer relation at once with its own "Church Council" of elders, and with the synods. When a congregation is less than five hundred, it exercises itself the rights of the Representative Council. This council is threefold more numerous than the council of elders. Its duties are to co-operate with the higher council in all matters relating to the property and expenditure of the Church, in the election of a pastor, and in whatever else the elders may submit to its deliberations. Both elders and members of the Representative Council are elected for six years, one-half retiring every three years.

(2.) The constitution of the *Kreis-Synoden*, or presbyteries. These are composed of the ministers of the district, with one lay representative from each congregation. If there be more than one minister of a congregation, its lay representatives are of the number of its ministers. These laymen are chosen by the "elders," either from their own number, or from the Representative Council of the Church, or from those who have previously held the office of "elders" for a period of three years. The four largest communities in the district, or all that have more than four thousand members, are each likewise entitled to elect one representative out of the most gifted and

experienced men of the whole district. The duties of this synod are the consideration of all matters brought before it, either by the consistory, the provincial synod, or the congregations in its district; the oversight of all the congregations, ministers, candidates, and church officers in the district,—to which end a report of the moral and religious state of all its congregations is to be made yearly; the administration of admonition and discipline where required; the care of all arrangements and institutions for purposes of Christian philanthropy; and the decision of all appeals that are made to it. Its ordinary meetings are to be held yearly. And its presiding board, which is authorised to act in its behalf during the year, is composed of the superintendent of the district, and four assessors, of whom one must be a clergyman.

(3.) The provincial synod is composed of two representatives from each presbytery *(Kreis-Synod)*, unless there be more than forty presbyteries in the province, in which case they are to be so arranged as to make forty electoral bodies, each sending two representatives. Of these representatives one is to be a clergyman, the other a layman. In addition, each presbytery that numbers more than 60,000 members in its congregations, is entitled to elect another representative out of the most experienced and honoured men of the province. Each representative on entering on his office takes the following vow:

"I vow, before God, that I will fulfil my obligations as a member of this synod with fidelity and care, according to the Word of God and the ordinances of the Evangelical Church of the country, and will earnestly labour so that the Church may grow up in all things unto Him who is the Head, even Christ."

The ordinary meetings of this Synod are triennial; but its duties are of the highest. All appeals from Presbyteries are made to it. It has supreme charge of all the province, maintaining the Church order in doctrine, worship, and polity, supplying religious needs, and removing abuses in the province. Further, in addition to similar functions to those of the Presbytery, it has concurrent legislative power with the *Ober-Kirchenrath*, inasmuch as no Church laws which concern its province can be published without its sanction; and it determines the hymnals, lesson-books, &c., which are to be used in the province.

(4.) The Extraordinary General Synod which is to be summoned forthwith, in order to deliberate upon the definitive

constitution of a General Synod for the other provinces of Prussia. The previous ordinances relate only to six eastern provinces, because in Westphalia and Rhineland the arrangements which they enact have been, to a large extent, already instituted. Now the eight provinces in which the Prussian Evangelical Church exists, are to be represented and united in the General Synod of that Church. This extraordinary General Synod is to be composed of a hundred and fifty members, elected by the eight provincial synods, six chosen by the theological faculties of six Prussian universities, six ecclesiastical jurists, eleven general superintendents, and thirty who are to be appointed by the king. The president of the *Ober-Kirchenrath* will preside in it, and its sole business will be to draw up the definitive constitution and the law of procedure for a permanent General Synod of the Evangelical Church of Prussia.

Such are the ground lines upon which this Evangelical Church is being built up. The election of Church Councils and Representative Councils took place all over the eastern provinces on the first Sunday of January; and, so far as our reports have informed us, that day on which the universal membership of the Church organised themselves in their separate congregations, chose their ruling congregational officers, and so began the work of their Church's free life and self-organisation, was a day welcomed with prayerful hope by thousands of Christ's faithful servants, and celebrated by them with thanksgiving and gladness.

Ere we close, we venture to indicate there are three dangers which threaten the new Prussian Church. We name them only to forewarn, from English experience, those who are now fashioning its young life and guiding its destinies. (1.) The suffrage of the Church is not based on any confession of faith; (2.) The rights of patronage, both as vested in the king and in other patrons, oppress the free activity of the Church; (3.) A strong centralising force seems to endanger the communal and district councils of the Church. These dangers are real and serious; but the wisdom and holy purpose which have achieved so much will, we trust, under God, avail to save the Evangelical Church of Prussia from these and all other future perils. "Ecclesia, victo Satanâ multa spolia dividat."

J. B. PATON.

## REPRINTED ARTICLES.

### I. *The Ruling Elder a Presbyter.*

By the late Rev. JAMES HENLEY THORNWELL, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology, Columbia, South Carolina.[1]

'THERE is but one hypothesis upon which, consistently with the Scriptures, Ruling Elders can be excluded from the right of imposing hands in the ordination of Ministers, and that is that they are not Presbyters—that they do not belong to that class of officers who, when assembled in council, possess, according to Paul (1 Tim. iv. 14), the right in question. If they are recognised in the Word of God as Presbyters, they are certainly entitled to be members of the Presbytery, and as certainly endowed with all the presbyterial authority which attaches to any of their brethren. The whole controversy, then, must turn upon the question whether or not they are scriptural Presbyters. What, then, is a Presbyter?

I have no hesitation in asserting that the fundamental idea conveyed by the term as a title of office, is that of legitimate authority to rule or govern. The princes of tribes and the heads of families in the Jewish State were denominated *elders*,

[1] From Dr Thornwell's Collected Writings, vol. iv., pp. 115–131.

[2] In conformity with my promise, I send you an article upon the right of Ruling Elders to impose hands in the ordination of Ministers. I have confined my argument exclusively to the constitution and usage of the Apostolic and Primitive Church. It was my intention, at first, to have noticed some of the general principles upon which the right has been denied, but I soon found that the limits of a single article were too narrow to allow so extensive a discussion; and, upon the whole, I thought more good would be done by drawing attention to that branch of the subject discussed in my piece. I know not how to account for it that there is so much ignorance among our Ministers and Churches in regard to the distinctive features of our system. Our name is derived from our Form of Government, and the characteristic element of that form is the importance which we attach to *Ruling Elders* in contradistinction from *Preachers*. To say, therefore, that a Ruling Elder is not entitled to the appellation of *Presbyter*, either in conformity with Scripture usage or primitive antiquity, is just to say that the fundamental principle of our polity is a human institution. The essay which I send you, though short and simple, has really been the fruit of much patient study and laborious investigation. I gave particularly the Apostolic Fathers a careful perusal in order to see what their testimony actually was, and I formed my own opinions without looking into the books which profess to collect their testimony. I afterward compared the results at which I had arrived with the labours of

because they were invested with subordinate jurisdiction in the conduct of the Commonwealth. How such an application of the term originated, it is not perhaps important to determine; but whatever reason we may choose to assign,—whether it be that, in the origin of States, superior age as implying superior wisdom and experience was the first pre-requisite to official elevation, or whether it be that the reverence and esteem, the veneration and respect, which should always be accorded to the hoary head, were intended by a delicate allusion to be transferred to rulers,—certain it is, that among all nations whose institutions are known to us, terms which, in their private and personal applications are descriptive only of superior age, are found as titles of authority and place. In their appropriation to stations of distinction in the State, they lose all reference to private and personal characteristics. In their public applications they cease to designate a *man*, and are used exclusively to designate an *office*. The Jewish Elder and the Roman Senator retained these titles of rank and authority, however few their years or limited their wisdom. In the Jewish Synagogue, from which the word was confessedly introduced into the Christian Church, *Presbyter* and *Ruler* were synonymous terms. It would seem, indeed, that, as these assemblies of the people were especially convoked to listen to the Law and to engage in acts of public adoration,

King and Bingham, and I saw nothing in them which induced me to change my opinion. I am still persuaded that *Presbyter* means simply a ruler, and that the office of Preacher is a function superadded to the Presbyterate; that the preacher in the Primitive Church was selected from the Consistory, and in the age of Ignatius was distinguished from the Presbyters by the title of *Bishop;* and that it was owing to accidental circumstances that the Presbyters ever came to be Preachers. I can trace in Ignatius the Constitution of our own Church. His extravagant language is certainly to be condemned, but I am inclined to think we err on the opposite extreme, and attach too little importance to the courts of God's house. I have long been convinced that our present method of conducting the affairs of the Church through institutions which can hardly be regarded as anything more than secular corporations is absolutely fatal to our beautiful system. Boards have usurped the place of Presbyteries, and the strength of the Church is sought in them rather than in the healthful action of the organisation which God has appointed. We have, in fact, two systems of polity—one in our Constitution which is a dead letter, and another in vigorous operation which, like Pharaoh's lean kine, eats up its rival. I was delighted to find that you were not ashamed to maintain the *Divine right of Presbyterianism.* Our Ministers and Elders must be brought to this point before they will feel the obligation of trying their own system.—[*Note to original Article.*]

to communicate oral instruction was no necessary part of the service. Hence, there was no office in the synagogue corresponding to the Preacher of the Christian churches. Any one who received permission from the Elders was at perfect liberty to address the people—an arrangement which could not have been admitted if there had been any public functionary whose duty required him to teach the congregation. To the Zakinim or Elders pertained the offices of government and discipline. They could bind and loose, and preside in the assemblies, but never seem to have looked on the imparting of oral instruction as any part of their appropriate functions. The Angel of the synagogue, if he were anything more than a menial servant, probably received his appellation from the fact that he acted as a messenger of the people to God in being the organ to express their prayers.

It is manifest, then, that *Presbyter* and *Preacher* were not originally interchangeable terms. There were Presbyters in the synagogue, but no Preachers. That the Apostles, in transferring the word to the Christian Church, enlarged its common and received acceptation so as to include the additional idea of authority to teach, making a *Christian Presbyter* and *Christian Preacher* equivalent expressions, is a proposition equally unsustained by scriptural usage or ecclesiastical antiquity. That Presbyters, as such, were not entitled to preach, nor Preachers, as such, entitled to rule, would seem to be an obvious conclusion from the marked difference which the Apostle repeatedly makes between the gift of teaching and the gift of government. Rulers and Teachers are different endowments with which the ascending Saviour furnished the Church, and no ingenuity of criticism can fasten the same signification upon such terms as *doctrine* and *government*. The miraculous gifts, too, which, according to Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 8), were speedily to cease—the gifts of prophecy, tongues and knowledge—all had evident reference to the function of teaching. The extraordinary officers who possessed these endowments were certainly teachers; and yet, from the fact that they did not continue to adorn the Church beyond the age of the Apostles, it may be safely inferred that they were not Presbyters. Among the first permanent officers of the Church, Ambrose enumerates "*rectores*" or Rulers.[1]

[1] Comm. on Ephes. iv.

While, however, it was the specific duty of a Presbyter to rule, he who was a Presbyter might also be a Teacher. There was nothing in the nature of the presbyterial office to prevent the individual who filled it from adding to its duties the function of public instruction; and we have the testimony of Paul himself that, in the constitution of the Primitive Church, some of the Elders did in fact preach, while others confined themselves to the appropriate duties of the eldership—that is to government and discipline. "Let the Elders," says the Apostle, "that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine" (1 Tim. v. 17).[1] To rule well was the duty of all Elders, regarded simply as Elders; to labour in word and doctrine was to do something more than the Presbyterate required, and therefore such persons were entitled not only to the respect which was due to Elders, but also to that which was due to Preachers. From this passage, it would also appear to have been the custom in the apostolic Church to select the Preachers from the class of Elders. Instead of making an additional order in the Church, the Apostles, it would seem, in the permanent arrangement of its constitution, required those who were to labour in word and in doctrine to be also strictly and properly Presbyters.[2] Hence the common distinction between Teaching and Ruling Elders. The distinction, however, is not strictly accurate. The eldership, as such, never includes teaching: this is always a superadded function, and it is not in consequence of his Presbyterial authority that an Elder preaches. For obvious reasons, the Elder who preached would always be the Moderator or president of the council of his brethren, just as in the constitution of Presbyterian churches at the present day the Minister always moderates the Session.

[1] The interpretation given in the text is certainly the obvious interpretation of this celebrated passage. For a full, complete and satisfactory defence of this ancient and general exposition, meeting all the arguments of Scultetus, Erastus, Bilson, Saravia, Mead, Grotius, Hammond, and Mosheim, see Owen on the True Nature of a Gospel Church, chap. vii.; Works vol. xx. With Owen concur Calvin, Cameron, Macknight, Rosenmüller, and the vast majority of Protestant writers.

[2] The following passage from Jerome may be regarded as proof of some such permanent arrangement: "Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos, *Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum*, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant; quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat."—Ep. 85 ad Evang.

Though they were all equal in office and equal in jurisdiction, and all equally constituted the Bishops of the Church, yet in the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles the term *Bishop* became generally restricted to the Presbyter who preached. An instance of a similar restriction of a generic term exists at the present day even among us. The word *Pastor* belongs as much to Elders as Preachers, and yet is generally confined exclusively to Preachers. Hence the limitation of the term *Bishop* should by no means astonish us. The reason of this restriction is to be sought in the fact that he always presided over the Presbytery. He differed from his brethren in nothing but the authority to preach and to dispense the sacraments; the dispensation of the sacraments being, in fact, only a symbolical method of preaching, and, therefore, an exclusive function of the Preacher's office. It was in consequence of possessing this power, and this alone, that he was entitled, according to the Apostle, to double honour. He shared in a larger degree the affections of the people, and received from his associates in office the high distinction of a permanent presidency. It is clear, from all the documents of early antiquity, that preaching was the leading and characteristic distinction of him who received the special appellation of *Bishop*. He preached by an inherent right; it pertained to his office, and he was bound under solemn sanctions to dispense the Word and sacraments.[1]

[1] In Cyprian's Letters, such phrases as "Episcopo tractante," "episcopos tractantes," are continually recurring, shewing that the ideas of a *Bishop* and *preaching* were continually associated in this Father's mind. There is just as conclusive testimony to this point in the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp. In chap. vi. of that epistle (Russell, vol, ii., p. 75), Bishops are called οἰκονόμοι, *stewards*, in evident allusion to 1 Cor. iv. 5, "stewards of the mysteries of God"—that is, Preachers of the Gospel and dispensers of the sacraments. Elders are called πάρεδροι, *assessors*—that is, assistants in council, a plain allusion to their authority to rule; and Deacons are called ὑπηρέται, *servants*, in allusion to their service, dispensing the bounties of the Church. In the same Epistle he directs Polycarp *to speak* to every one as God should give him help, and characterises his flock as "*disciples*," evidently presenting Polycarp in the light of a teacher. (Russell, vol. ii., p. 64.) In his Epistle to the Trallians, chap. iii. (Russell, vol. ii., p. 172), he directs them to "reverence the Deacons as an institution of Christ, to reverence the Bishop as the son of the Father, and the Elders as the council of God." Here is still the same distinction—the *Son reveals* the Father, and the Bishop *reveals* —that is, *teaches*—the *truth*, while the Presbyters are his assessors in council. If the reader wishes to see the respective qualifications of Bishops and Elders in the time of Ignatius, and to be yet more fully satisfied that the one had

Those, on the other hand, who retained the original name of *Elders* had no such inherent right. "It is not lawful," says Ignatius, "either to baptise or celebrate the eucharist without the Bishop." Again: "Let no one perform any ecclesiastical office—such as preaching or the sacraments—without the Bishop." The same was determined in the councils of Laodicea, Arles, and Toledo, and such also was the testimony of Tertullian, Jerome, and Ambrose.[1]

We learn from Posidonius that until the time of Austin, in the African churches, Elders were not permitted to preach in the presence of the Bishops, and only by his authority and as his substitute when the Bishop was absent. They did not officiate by virtue of any power inherent in their order.[2] From

primary reference to *teaching* and the other to *ruling*, let him compare the 1st and 2d sections of the Epistle to Polycarp (Russell, vol ii., pp. 64, 65) with the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, section vi. (Russell, vol. ii. p. 240.) It is plain also from the Apostolical Constitutions that the peculiar duties of a Bishop were precisely such as are imposed upon those who in the Presbyterian Church are now denominated Pastors. (Vid. Lib. ii., c. 27, 28, &c., and Lib. viii., c. 4, 30, 31.) These testimonies might be indefinitely increased, but enough has been said to shew the real distinction between a Bishop and an Elder. It was not a distinction of *order* or *ecclesiastical jurisdiction*. In all acts of government and discipline they were united, but one was a *steward* of the mysteries of God, a *dispenser* of the Word and sacraments, and the other was not. The Bishop and Elders of Ignatius are precisely the *Pastor* and *Session* of a Presbyterian congregation. So it was in the days of Cyprian, as might be shewn at large.

[1] Ignat. Epist. ad Smyr. c. viii. (Russell, vol. ii., p. 50)—"Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν." There is proof in this context, it may be observed by the way, that the Bishop was simply the Pastor of the church. "Wherever the Bishop appears, there let the multitude (the congregation) be." Ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω.

The Council of Arles, according to one reading, says: "Ut Presbyteri sine conscientia episcoporum nihil faciant." (Can. 19.) The Council of Laodicea says (Can. 57, Labb. i., p. 1505) Τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ τῆς γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. The Council of Toledo says (Labb. ii., p. 1226), Sine conscientia autem episcopi nihil penitus faciendum; or as it is in the margin, Nihil presbyteri agere presumant. To these may be added xxxviii. Can. Apost. Labb. i., p. 33.

Dandi jus quidem, says Tertullian (De Baptismo, C. xvii.), summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc Presbyteri et diaconi: non tamen sine auctoritate episcopi, propter ecclesiæ honorem.

Jerome (Dial. cont. Lucif.) testifies: Inde venit ut, sine jussione episcopi, neque Presbyter, neque diaconus jus habet baptizandi. See also Ambrose, De Sacrament., L. iii., c. i.

[2] Eidem presbytero potestatem dedit coram se in ecclesia evangelium prædicandi ac frequentissime tractandi: contra usum quidem ac consuetudinem

the same authority we gather that the custom of permitting them at all was introduced from the Eastern churches.[1] How is such language consistent with the supposition that they are *ex officio* Ministers of the Word? After the disturbance created by Arius, we are informed that the Presbyters of Alexandria were debarred from preaching by the authority of the Bishop.[2] Now, if they possessed the same divine right with himself to dispense the Word, if they had regarded themselves in any other light than as exercising a delegated trust, and acting under the responsibility of the Bishop whose proper place it was to preach, how could they with a conscience void of offence have submitted to such an edict from one who was not officially their superior? The truth is, it is perfectly preposterous to make *Presbyter* and *Preacher* synonymous terms. To effect such a confusion of things separate and distinct was the work of time. The custom of permitting the Elders to preach originated, in the first instance, from a laudable desire on the part of the Bishops to have their people instructed during their absence. What at first, however, was granted as an indulgence, soon came to be demanded as a right, and the innovation did not stop with Elders. Even the Deacons, from a similar permission granted under similar circumstances, claimed eventually to be preachers of the Word and stewards of the mysteries of God. This was a more remarkable change than that which took place with reference to the Eldership. Here an office, notoriously instituted for the express purpose of protecting Preachers from secular affairs, undergoes a transformation so astonishing and wonderful, as to assume the very duties which it was intended to relieve. The same ambition which would prompt the Elders to aspire to the double honour which was due to the Preacher's office would prompt the Bishops to indulge their humour, since as the Presbyters expanded into Preachers they themselves would expand into Prelates. Hence, from the common pride and vanity of both Bishops and Elders, preaching came eventually to be regarded as a necessary element of Presbyterial authority, though in the beginning it was unquestionably

Africanarum ecclesiarum; unde etiam ei nonnulli episcopi detrahebant. Postea bono precedenti exemplo, accepta ab episcopis potestate, presbyteri nonnulli coram episcopis tractare cœperunt Verbum Dei.—Vit. Aug. c. v.

[1] Ibid. [2] Socrates, Lib. 5. Soz. Lib. 7.

otherwise. Still, however, as late as the fourth century, when Prelacy had made extensive and formidable encroachments, and almost if not entirely obliterated the original application of the term *Presbyter*, we find some traces of the ancient constitution in the churches of Northern Africa. The *seniores plebis*, who are confessed to have been ecclesiastical officers, were the Ruling Elders of the primitive age. Some learned men have been inclined to deny this position, because in the writings of the times they are distinguished from Presbyters. But about this time *Presbyter* had generally become a title of the ministry, and hence, in distinguishing the *seniores plebis* from Presbyters, the meaning is that they were not Preachers, they were not the Presbyters of the day. This, however, is no sufficient proof that they were not precisely the Presbyters who, in the times of the Apostles, were content to rule without attempting to preach, no more than the studied distinction which the writings of the Fathers make between Elder and Bishop proves that they were not originally the same. In the said tendencies to Prelacy which the Church was everywhere exhibiting, it is impossible to account for the introduction of a class of officers so repugnant to the genius and spirit of the hierarchy as these seniors of the people at any period subsequent to that of the Apostles; and hence I am compelled to regard them as venerable monuments of a race that was rapidly dying away. As Bishops had now discarded the ancient title of *Presbyter* and assumed the prerogatives of Prelacy, and as Presbyters had aspired to the more honourable functions of labouring in word and doctrine, these humble rulers were content to manifest their modesty and wisdom by the unassuming and scriptural name of *Elders of the people* (πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λάου).

From the preceding statements it appears that, in the Primitive and Apostolic Church, Presbyters, as such, were simply and exclusively rulers. One of the Presbytery in each congregation was usually invested with authority to preach and dispense the sacraments, and became by consequence the permanent president of the body. This preaching Elder received in process of time as his distinctive appellation the title of *Bishop*, while the others continued to be called by the general name of office *Presbyters* or *Elders*. The sole distinction in the first instance between the Bishop and the Elders

lay simply in the power of preaching. It was his privilege and duty by virtue of his office, but it did not pertain to the essential nature of the Presbyterate. Gradually, however, from indulgence on the part of the Ministers and ambition on the part of the rulers, they began to labour as Preachers of the Gospel, so that in process of time *Presbyter* lost its original meaning of ruler, *Bishop* lost its primitive meaning of Preacher, and those who ought to have been rulers became Ministers, and those who ought to have been Ministers became Prelates; and Diocesan Episcopacy, with all its abominations, was established upon the ruins of parochial Presbytery. This view of the primitive constitution of the Church reconciles the testimony of the ancient Fathers, which upon any other hypothesis is full of contradiction and absurdity, and certainly accords with the obvious interpretation of the accounts which are furnished in the Acts and Epistles touching the organisation and arrangement of the churches founded by the Apostles. As, then, Ruling Elders are strictly and properly the Presbyters of Scripture, they are, according to the Apostle, entitled to lay on hands in the ordination of Ministers. The argument is as simple as it is irresistible. The imposition of hands is the prerogative of Presbytery; Presbytery is composed exclusively of Presbyters; Presbyters are strictly the rulers of the Church; therefore, Presbytery consists of rulers, and therefore rulers are entitled to ordain. Every proposition in this chain is sustained by express words of Scripture. There is no possibility of excluding Ruling Elders from the right to impose their hands, without shewing in the first instance that they are not Presbyters, or, what is the same, that a Presbyter must necessarily be a Preacher. When this last proposition is established, Ruling Elders may not only give up the right to ordain, but every other right which pertains to their office. They become a mere human appendage to the Church, officers of man's institution, whom it is presumption to admit into ecclesiastical courts. Presbyterianism stands or falls with the distinction between Ruling and Teaching Elders. There is, in addition to this scriptural argument, satisfactory proof that for three hundred years after the time of the Apostles the right of the Presbyters to ordain Presbyters was universally acknowledged. The third canon of the fourth Council of Carthage provides that in the ordination of Elders, while the Bishop of

the church offered up the ordaining prayer, the whole Consistory or Presbytery should join with him in imposing hands upon the head of the candidate.[1] The Council of Ancyra, which was still earlier, recognises the rights of city Presbyters to administer ordination even in different parishes from their own with the consent of the Bishop.[2] That they could also participate in the ordination of Bishops, to say nothing of the testimony of Scripture in the case of Timothy, is decisively proved by the fact that Pelagius, bishop of Rome, was ordained by one Presbyter in conjunction with two Bishops; and as the canons at the time required the presence of at least three Bishops, and as the ordination of Pelagius was admitted to be valid, a Presbyter must have been equal to a Bishop, and the imposition of his hands just as available as that of a Bishop.[3] To these cases may be added the testimony of Firmilian in the age of Cyprian. That Presbyters, however, did not ordain by indulgence, as they preached and baptised, is clear from the oft-repeated testimony of Paul, which vests an absolute right of ordination in the Presbytery. "All power and grace," says Firmilian,[4] "is constituted in the Church where Elders preside and have the power of baptising, confirming and ordaining." Jerome distinctly asserts that, from the days of Mark the Evangelist until the time of Heraclas and Dionysius, the Presbyters at Alexandria made their own Bishop. He was elected, in the first place, from among themselves, and then ordained by the parochial Presbytery, as Timothy was ordained by the Presbytery of Derbe or Lystra. This seems to be the obvious meaning of the words, and is a plain proof of the existence in primitive times of that arrangement to which we have already referred, by which the Minister of the church—he who was to labour in word and doctrine—was required to be a Presbyter.

[1] Presbyter cum ordinatur, episcopo eum benedicente, et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri qui presentes sunt manus suas juxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant.—Lab. ii., p. 1199.

[2] Χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ.—Labb. i., p. 1461.

[3] Lib. Pontif. Vit. Pelag. Dum non essent episcopi, qui eum ordinarent, inventi sunt duo episcopi, Joannes de Perusio et Bonus de Ferentino, et Andreas, Presbyter de Sotia, et ordinaverunt eum.

[4] Apud Cypr. Epist. 75—Omnis potestas et gratia in ecclesia constituta sit ubi præsident majores natu, qui et baptisandi et manum imponendi et ordinandi possident potestatem.

The argument from Scripture and antiquity might here be regarded as complete, and the right of Ruling Elders to impose hands in ordination unanswerably established, if it were not that a mass of testimony exists, apparently inconsistent with this hypothesis, which the interests of truth require to be explained. Bishops, it must be confessed, began at a very early period to be ordained by Bishops alone. According to the first Council of Arles and the third of Carthage, the presence of at least three Bishops was necessary to give validity to the ordination of a Bishop. The Canons and Constitutions, which go under the name of the *Apostles*, though clearly the products of a later age, required as indispensable the presence of but two. These testimonies do not, as is generally supposed, exclude Presbyters from participating in the process, though the presumption is that, as their co-operation was not regarded as essential, they soon ceased to unite with the Bishops in this act of ecclesiastical authority. That they had the right to unite with them is plain from the case of Pelagius. Now, if in the times of the Apostles the parochial Presbytery was the proper ordaining body, how was so remarkable a change effected? How, especially, did it happen in so short a time that Ruling Elders should rarely exercise the right of ordination except in reference to their own associates? There are two causes which will be found, I apprehend, to explain the phenomenon. After the extraordinary officers of the Church had ceased, it devolved, of course, upon the neighbouring churches to supply new congregations with ecclesiastical officers; and as it would be more convenient for the pastors to meet—as they were the persons most likely to be known and most likely to be summoned to attend in council—the Presbytery which ordained in new and vacant churches was composed for the most part of preaching Elders or Bishops. Presbyters at first were not excluded, but as they were summoned only through their pastors, and as all the neighbouring pastors were summoned alike, a college of Elders could be easily constituted without their presence, and hence they no doubt soon ceased to appear. In a vacant church the existing Eldership might have ordained, but as they had been always accustomed to the presidency of a pastor, they would call in the neighbouring Bishops to assist them.[1]

[1] The passage from Jerome has been already cited. It is a mistake to suppose that he has reference to *the election* of a Bishop, because (1) that was

Hence, there soon arose a distinction betwixt the method of ordaining a Presbyter and the method of ordaining a Bishop. The one continued to be done by the parochial Presbytery, and the other was done by a provincial Presbytery, and the Canons which have already been noticed, and which are usually pleaded as proof of the exclusive right of Bishops to ordain, should perhaps be regarded as only defining the number of ministers necessary to constitute a quorum of the provincial Presbytery. There was no need to mention Elders, because they were always found on the spot in the case of vacant churches without being gathered from other congregations, and because in new churches, Ministers being Elders, a true Presbytery existed, though composed only of the rulers who preached. Such a provincial Presbytery was evidently necessary; it was only a fuller development of the same principle on which the Session was founded. In the age of Cyprian, however, it was an occasional body, not a permanent one, as it is with us—regularly meeting upon its adjournment. It was called together only when needed to ordain a Bishop. In this way arose the distinction betwixt the ordination of Bishops and Elders. What was first a mere custom, originating in convenience, soon became the law of the Church. The change thus accidentally introduced was next confirmed by a miserable fallacy. Ordination was early regarded as a sort of spiritual generation of Ministers; and, as like could only beget like, it was supposed impossible for those who could not preach to invest others with authority to do so. The ordainer could only transmit to the ordained the rights which he himself possessed, and hence Presbyters were regarded as incompetent, from the nature of their duties, to participate in the ordination of any but Presbyters. This false principle of itself, without any previous neglect on the part of the Elders, would have been sufficient to exclude them from the provincial Presbytery. An error of this sort is too strong for argument; ancient customs and prescriptive rights might have been pleaded in vain; and in spite of all the considerations drawn from apostolic practice,

done by the people, as Cyprian testifies (Epist. 68), and (2) the Bishop is spoken of as *elected* when the Presbyters do what is implied in the verb *nominabant*. How did the Presbyter elect get the *name* of Bishop? Evidently by *ordination*. This installed him in the office, and of course gave him the name.

the fallacy would have ultimately triumphed. The power of a sophism to drown the voice of reason and Scripture may be seen in the case of transubstantiation, which led to the withholding of the cup from the laity; though this measure of high-handed tyranny was in open defiance of law, precedent, and truth. Combine this principle, however, with the previous neglect of the Elders, and the foundations of Prelacy are open, palpable, and clear. When the Presbyters were excluded from the provincial Presbytery, Bishops became a distinct order, superior to Elders, and accountable only to God. Now, that both the causes really existed as facts cannot be denied. The letters of Cyprian shew that it was the custom on the death of a Bishop to issue such a circular to the neighbouring Bishops, and that the presence of all the Bishops in a province at the ordination of a successor in the vacant church was usually requested.[1] The first canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, in prescribing the examination of the Bishop to be ordained, adds that when he has given satisfaction touching his faith and qualifications, "he should then be ordained by the consent of the clergy and people, and with the concurrence of the bishops of the whole province."[2] Other testimonies to the same purport might be easily collected, but the custom will hardly be disputed. That the erroneous conception in regard to the nature of ordination, to which reference has been made, prevailed at an early period, may be gathered from the remark of Epippanius, that "the order of Bishops begets fathers to the Church, which the order of Presbyters cannot do, but only begets sons by the regeneration of baptism."[3] This passage

[1] Cyprian, Epist. 63. [2] Labb. ii., p. 1199.

[3] Hæres. 75. In the misconception of Epiphanius we see the germ of the "sacrament of orders." In such fatal and miserable blunders, such gross and flagrant fallacies, one is often reminded of the memorable parody of Johnson: "Who drives fat oxen must himself be fat." It is to be regretted that even in the Presbyterian Church there is too strong a disposition to look upon ordination as a mystic charm which communicates an invisible *charisma* to the person ordained, which he did not possess before. Divested of all obscurity, it is evidently nothing more than a process or series of acts by which the people of God and the rulers of His Church manifest their conviction of a Divine call to the office of ruling and teaching. The people express their approbation by election; the rulers of the Church, after a full and thorough examination, express theirs by prayer and the imposition of hands. They declare in this way that the candidate before them is called of God to the Elder's office. What is there in this inconsistent with the character of him who rules? And why may not one ruler as well as another express his con-

requires no comment. If these two causes, which unquestionably existed, were adequate to produce the effect, it is easy to explain how, consistently with the original right of Elders to ordain, they gradually ceased to exercise it, and eventually surrendered it in the case of Bishops. This hypothesis completely reconciles the apparently conflicting testimony of documents. From Jerome we would infer that it was the custom of the Elders at Alexandria to ordain their own bishop. From the authorities cited above it would appear to have been the custom of the Church to ordain a new Bishop by a council of his neighbours of whom three were necessary to constitute a quorum. Both may have been true. In later times we find no allusion to the Elders—their touch was profaneness—because the neighbouring bishops had taken the matter into their own hands. The progress can be distinctly traced by which the ordination of bishops passed from the hands of the parochial Presbytery to the Episcopal Council. That whole mass of testimony, therefore, which seems to vest the right of ordaining Ministers exclusively in the hands of Ministers is thus satisfactorily discarded, and the divine authority of Ruling Elders to impose hands in the ordination of preachers is placed on an impregnable basis.

viction that A or B is called of God, and accordingly commend him by prayer and imposition of hands to the Word of His grace? If the Presbyterial part of ordination is not a *sacrament*, but a simple act of *government*, I confess it passes my comprehension to perceive why an Elder may not join in it. If it were a sacrament then it would be a seal of the covenant, and a symbol of its blessings. To administer it under such circumstances would be a *virtual preaching*, and therefore a Ruling Elder could not do it. Hence, the Session examines a man and admits him to the communion of the Church, but the *pastor alone baptises*. Baptism, however, does not *admit* the individual into the church; it is administered to him because he *is* in and of course entitled to its privileges. The act of the Session—the *parochial Presbytery—admitted* him; by their vote they expressed their conviction that he was *in* the covenant, and *therefore* the pastor applies to him its precious seal, and so in reference to the Lord's Supper. There is no alternative between making ordination a sacrament and allowing Elders to unite in the process. One or the other must be done.

## II. *Calvin and Calvinism.*[1]

HOWEVER men may differ about the merits of the great Reformation, it has its undisputed place in the history of Europe as the real turning-point between the old and the new; and, among those who look upon it as a religious movement, it is truly regarded as second in the history of Christianity only to its introduction in the resurrection of old truths and the outpouring of new influences among men.

As in the first reformers of the world—the Apostles—we have four distinct types of mind, so here, in these true successors of the Apostles, Luther is the Peter, the primate of the group,—fresh, passionate, homely, and out-spoken; Zwingli comes close to James in practical emphasis and direct manliness of character; Melanchthon is a true younger brother of John, not so lofty, nor, in his moderation, so decisive in his accent, but full of the same contemplative love and deep fountain thoughts; and certainly Calvin may well take the place of Paul. For, while they differ by nature and grace, as every marked man does from another, in the amazing flexibility of mental movement and winning tenderness of personal affection, which, in Paul, sprung up amidst the strictest and widest logical processes, yet they are kindred in a certain continuity of absorbing purpose, a love of clear-cut definition in statement of truth and unswerving consistency in its development, and, above all, the central predominance of the same high landmarks of grace and predestination. These two men look out towards each other from the distance of sixteen centuries, and are felt to be essentially the same.

I have been asked to speak to you on this important occasion on Calvin and Calvinism. I have not been limited to any particular phase of a subject so suggestive on many sides. I shall therefore try, so far as I am able, to gather up various and vital impressions about him, his work, and its relation to present circumstances. I shall take for granted your possession of details which there is no space to include, and am encouraged, as I advance, by the assurance that there is no theme

[1] Read before the English Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, in October last, and afterwards privately printed.

that comes so close to the principles and history of this assembly.

What is of greatest value in any man is the work which he himself is, through the gift of God, and the course of his life. And, to any thoughtful minister or Christian, nothing so unfolds or verifies the meaning and power of Christianity as a great life which it has inspired and governed. The beginnings of Calvin were small. Of parents one stage above the mechanic class, in Noyon, a little town in Picardy,—of an able, aspiring father, and an earnest, anxious mother,—he was born in the year 1509. Luther was already twenty-six years, Melanchthon twelve, Zwingli twenty-five, and Knox four years old at this time. Herein, too, he is like Paul, the last of the Apostles—the one who was to sum up their labours, to bind up their scattered sheaves, and to garner them in strong storehouses for the use of many generations. His death took place in 1564, so that he lived only to his fifty-fifth year. None of the reformers lived to the threescore and ten. Luther and Melanchthon died at the same age, sixty-three; Zwingli was struck down in battle when thirty-seven; Calvin wore out his life wearily and bravely, in long years of a lonely sentinel's watching, and as lonely commander's burden of a hard and wide battle. John Knox lived eight years longer than Calvin, and the last words read to him were from his friend's "Commentary on the Ephesians."

Calvin was, "from certain vital signs," as Milton says of himself in another relation, destined for the Church. He began his training at an early hour, and the stuff out of which God moulded the reformer, we discern already in the boy of ten, whom, from his strict conduct and bold reproofs, his school-fellows, as is the manner of boys, nicknamed the Accusative. Calvin was a man not accustomed to speak of himself. Luther is always Luther. Calvin is, for the most part, Calvinism; but in his preface to his "Commentary on the Psalms," he gives, in rapid outlines, his own rendering of the way in which God had led him. Strange to say, it is in David that Calvin saw most of himself and his history. David and Calvin—how opposite! Yet it is always the contraries that clasp in closest affinity. And so he writes:—"But as David was taken from the sheepfolds and elevated to the rank of supreme authority, so God, having originally taken me from

my obscure and humble condition, has reckoned me worthy of being invested with the honourable office of a preacher and minister of the gospel."

Calvin could not help feeling that he was a king, though the king was hidden under a Geneva cloak; and none ever felt more than he did that he was so emphatically, by the grace of God. He was thoroughly trained at Orleans, Paris, and Bourges. His first stage was as a scholar; the old Latin classics became his masters, models, and companions. From these he drew the style which has carried his masses of truth down to the present times, and by which he stamped upon the French language that firm precision and fine grace which have made it supreme in the expression of thought. Moreover, with the new-born zeal of the times, he added to these monuments of genius—among which Cicero remained his favourite to the end—the knowledge of the Greek classics. More than the discovery of the Nineveh marbles in our time, as much as the reading of the old foot-prints on the geological strata, was this exhuming of the old Greek thought and life. It created the *Renaissance* with its humanists—men who turned from the Church, and, in many instances, from Christianity, and gave themselves up to pagan letters and philosophy. Rabelais and Montaigne in France, Mirandola and Bembo in Italy, were the fathers of our modern literature.

But, looking in another direction, the influence which loosened many from the Church turned them to the Bible, and especially to the Greek Testament, by his edition of which, in 1516, Erasmus, a sort of well-clad John the Baptist, with irony, instead of denunciation—a man as much humanist as Christian—prepared the way for the Reformation. During those years when Calvin was at College—the period of life when the young and empty mind is open to all impressions, and especially the latest and most living—the air was full of the stir of new ideas, the soil charged with the sap and promise of a glorious spring-time. Cicero, on the one hand, and Paul on the other; Plato, with his glorious old ideals, and John, with his divine, ever-young revelations—these stood over against the Church, and claimed over supremacy fresh and enthusiastic spirits. Calvin was graciously, and after a sharp but comparatively short struggle, led to choose Paul and John,

and, through them, Christ. With that instancy and thoroughness, which are Calvin all through, he renounced the Church of Rome, and surrendered absolutely to the almighty grace of God. In full accordance with his open nature, Luther lets us into the whole secret of his long struggle ere the battle was won. Justification through faith in Christ was his living experience and doctrine. In the story of his conversion, therefore, the successive phases are most vivid and touching. But Calvin, consistent here with himself, only gives hints, brief but burning, of a movement in which God was the great agent; and so he gathered his experience, rounded and shaped his doctrine, on the master-theme of grace. This inward change was taking place from his eighteenth to his twenty-second year; and in 1531, when he was twenty-four, he renounced definitely all his old allegiance to the Roman Church—and to more than the Roman Church, to all influence of any decisive sort from his humanist studies. Luther was pushed out of the Church, and was thirty-four when, as was congenial with his poetic and sympathetic nature, he broke off, though with much of the old adhering to him. Zwingli and Melanchthon came clean out of Rome, but leant in much to the Greek masters. In Calvin there was, rightly or wrongly, a thoroughness, which marks the man, and made him the reformer he became. I cannot help thinking of him here as of the young Napoleon, coming late in the day of Revolution, and, with new methods, changing the whole situation; or rather, afterwards, he reminds us of Wellington, in the coolness and patience of his courage, as well as the minuteness of his organisation, waiting in his corner in Geneva, and ruling large portions of Europe from his camp on the entrenched heights of truth. But, besides this thoroughness of conviction, Calvin had gained in his training as a lawyer, the method, the strategy of his future battle. He had turned aside a year or two from the Church and its studies to the law, and there, as in all things, he speedily became foremost among the first. This faculty of taking a definite and far-reaching grasp of a subject served him well in every department of his religious work, and made him the first pleader, as well as final judge, of the great cause of the day—Reformation against Romanism. This is always a most valuable training. I find Paul, Tertullian, and Augustine went through it; and how much it

contributed to their clear and compacted views, you can easily see. John Knox at Haddington was also a notary public, and learned his skill in drawing up the Articles of the Reformation of Scotland by drawing up deeds about a few acres in the neighbourhood of his native burgh.

I can now only mark the events which proceeded from this man, the scholar, the lawyer, the Christian. I shall pass over the details of progress and change, and seize the main points of crisis and achievement.

The first great event was the publication, in 1536, in Basle, when a young man of twenty-seven, of his great Code of Doctrine and Discipline, the "Institutes of the Christian Religion." It was this book mainly that made Scaliger, the sovereign dictator of letters, say:—"Calvin is alone among theologians; there is no ancient to compare with him;" and drew from Sir William Hamilton, well able to judge and little inclined to praise the reformers, the unqualified eulogium, "Looking merely to his learning and ability, Calvin was superior to all modern, perhaps to all ancient, divines. Succeeding ages have certainly not exhibited his equal. To find his peer we must ascend at least to Aquinas or Augustine." No book of theological doctrine equal to it has been produced during the last three centuries, unless some claim is made for placing beside or near it the great work of Schleiermacher; and though, looking back, the eye is now and then caught by the massive works of Aquinas, and the small but profound and suggestive pieces of Anselm, yet it is only when the "City of God" *(De Civitate Dei)* of Augustine comes upon the horizon, that an equal, if not a superior, makes itself felt to be there. It was a little book at first of 500 pages and six chapters, but it grew during twenty-three years to five times the size, till, in the last edition, in 1559, five years before he died, you have Calvin in the full height, and depth, and length, and breadth of his teaching. It is curious to watch how the best ideas, the carefully-devised phrases, the place and proportion of connecting thoughts that appear time after time in his Commentaries and occasional pieces, are laid up in store, fitted into, and grow to the increase of the whole work.

To read it through is an intellectual drill, a moral test, a sacred service. For he never relaxes the demand on attention, never descends from a lofty standard, and never ceases to stir,

either to shrinking or yielding, the religious nature. I do not think there is a single kindling of imagination, even when the granite of his passionate logic is heated sevenfold. There are passages on prayer and on the glory and misery of man, in which, rising parallel to his great themes, he takes rank in sublimity as impressive and more severe than Bossuet, and becomes, if less penetrating and passionate, as mighty as Pascal. Still, he is of intellect, not imagination, all compact. Locke, in his essay, has one or two famous images; Calvin, in his work, not one. In this aspect it resembles some bare granite peak like Sinai; but in another, which grows upon the reader, a new impression is added. At first, as you approach, it looks large, indeed, but not overwhelming; only the longer you travel, day by day, nearer to it, it grows the more, and when you pass away from it, it seems still to haunt the eye and command the attention. It is the unity, the comprehensiveness, that refuses to break into parts, which claims the whole mind; and so, unadorned, self-sustained, massive, it overpowers the conviction, and calls forth a kindred feeling towards a work which we gradually discover could only have been piled up by a soul that burns steadily through the whole mass with a purpose and patience that assert themselves in abiding force, and not in transient flash or flame. It is, in fact, this sheer unshrinking unity, as of some monolith, this intellectual passion, this sacrifice of all fear of consequences, this Sinai-like lonely majesty—for it becomes majestic in the end —which forms the essential character of Calvin, intellectually and morally, whether for attraction or repulsion. Why, then, have Sinai wooded to the top, with its sides blossoming into flowers, or parcelled out in parterres? and why have Calvin other than he is in his bare and lonely grandeur?

By this book he did an immense service to the Reformation. In its preface, well known as the letter addressed to Francis I., he speaks as a king to a king, and as with sound of trumpet enters upon the defence of the rising and persecuted cause. Like a master builder, the "City of God" rises under his hands like Jerusalem, which was a city compactly built together. He completed the temple, with its three courts, doctrine, government, and discipline; the relation of the soul to Christ, in grace; to each other Christian soul, in the Church; to the world outside, in the State. The unity of Rome, the

charm of which can with difficulty be thrown off, was met by a unity of Reformation by which to this day it is balanced. The magnificent constructive power found a place for everything. It harmonised the Augustinian doctrine of grace and the Lutheran principle of justification; the Swiss leaning to the central position of the Word of God, and the German leaning to that of the living Christ in the individual soul. It moved with unhalting step straight on from the first thought of God in the creation and redemption of man, to the visible embodiment of that thought in a spiritually independent Church on earth, and an everlasting fellowship of the blessed in heaven.

And while the book is great in its internal completeness, it is great also in reference to Calvin's mind. Though it grew fivefold in bulk in the course of its many editions, it was only as the man grows out of the child. He changed nothing in the leading principles, hardly anything in the secondary details. Luther had no systematising genius; his thoughts were not like a rock, but like a river—a noble stream, indeed, changing its course, but ever bent for the ocean. Melanchthon had an organizing power, and his "Common Places" (*Loci Communes*) were published when he was only twenty-four. But though he formulated Luther's principles, still he did not build the walls all round, and, moreover, shifted in after years the very basis of his system, and vacillated between divine grace and human will; while Calvin lived out the old canon of the Church Father: "Everywhere, always, and in all things the same;" and so his work, while it grew in size and changed in arrangement, never lost the power that attends unwavering and severe consistency.

But I must pass from this book, which embodies the genius of Calvin and lays down the programme of his whole life, to another department of his labours in which he shines with almost as great—I shall not say splendour, for that is not the word to apply to Calvin, but—luminousness. Calvin's Commentaries are masterpieces in that class of Christian literature, and he ranks among its chiefs in all the essential qualities of sufficient learning, surpassing mental size in height and breadth, and, best of all, keen spiritual susceptibility. Men who differ most widely from him in the results of his judgments, agree in extolling his marvellous sagacity and tact, and above all, his transparent fairness and his want or suppression

of bias. None can doubt his learning, insight, and devoutness; but to have the quality of exegetical honesty in surpassing measure, adds moral singleness to the intellectual manifoldness of Calvin. He had such an implicit trust in God's Word, that he committed himself to it whithersoever it listed: and so he dismisses, with a decisiveness a Rationalist might envy and could not surpass, so-called Messianic prophecies, texts in support of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, texts even for predestination and particular redemption. Calvin had a faith so firm in the general system of truth in the Bible, that he was under little or no temptation to mix the hay, wood, and stubble of doubtful interpretation and disputed readings with the gold, silver, and precious stones that lay around in the rich and ample quarry.

Such, with many occasional pieces, were the works of the mind and pen of Calvin; and his were works indeed, coming from the very heart as well as head, and meant to do something to further the great aim of his life. There was another department in which he excelled. His daily work was that of an ecclesiastical and civil statesman. The little town of Geneva, in a corner of sloping land between the Alps and Jura, with its border position between north and south Europe, was free at that moment of its old civil and ecclesiastical rulers, and so a clear space in which to build up a new community, on both sides, spiritual and civil, in Church and State; and that town, though little in size, and containing at that time only some twelve or fourteen thousand inhabitants—in fact, only three thousand grown men—was the very place Providence had fitly chosen to be the cradle of a new and mighty influence. How Calvin was led to that city has all the interest of a Christian romance; how he lived, laboured, and died there, has elements of keen pathos and tragedy—elements, too, of most instructive history. We cannot in the least enter upon it here. His first appearance there is noted in the archives as that Frenchman, "Iste Gallus;" now, Geneva is known principally because of the name of Calvin. It is a history which recalls in many points that of another great reformer, Moses, the first leader of the Church. Both were the building up, in a place set apart by geographical position, of a new Church and State; not merely the teaching of a new doctrine, but the instant and energetic application of

it to all life in the community. The Jews and the Genevese were very much the same material; both had left their past, but had nothing fixed for the present; both were partly superstitious and partly libertine. Hence the series of changes, exiles, taunts, conflicts, submissions; the loneliness of both leaders, the desertions by ancient comrades, and yet the homage, intense and unswerving, of loyal souls. Both died, catching a glimpse only of an unattained perfection, and leaving a name graven on every heart, but marking no spot where the weary brain and hand that moved and ruled all repose. The initials of J. C. and J. K., which I have read on the supposed graves of Calvin and Knox—in the public churchyard of Geneva, and the Parliament Square of Edinburgh—are all the monument of two men whose memorial belongs to the whole Church.

We have already indicated the great lines of his intellectual character, the absolute clearness of his intellect within its own range, the grasp of principles, and the manipulation of details, the assertion of every deduction from his premises, and the close linking, as of coat of mail, of the whole system. And to these it is to be added, that he forgot nothing, but kept his mind always at the same height and pressure; that by the working of some sort of mental spectrum the ray of intellect was always and powerfully there, whatever other element is wanting. Comparing him with the men who stand beside him in likeness of religious creed and conformation, Calvin is unique. Take Paul, and you never have in Calvin such chapters as his psalm of love and his argument and prophecy of the resurrection, nor such a dignified propriety and playful persuasiveness as charms you in his Epistle to Philemon. Augustine, his great master—the only one of the fathers to whom (shall I say ?) he takes off his hat when he meets him—had a range of swift and creative speculation, a fiery African glow and *abandon* of soul, that never either rouses or ripples the sculpturesque fixedness of Calvin; and in Jonathan Edwards, with all his logic, there is a mingling of metaphysical reasoning and mystical yearning. Calvin, in fact, was more the pure reasoner and deducer. Neither speculative nor mystical, he syllogised —got his matter out of the Scripture, and shaped it accordingly. What he thus lost in warm attractiveness and burning force, he gains, however, in severe imperatorial measure and authority.

Looked at socially, Calvin does not bulk; though he could make himself feared and also loved after a fashion. I have thought it was a great loss to Calvin that he had not a Philip Melanchthon, an equal in his own department, as was the privilege of Luther. But, if he had no ardours, he had no mean jealousies or envies. It was a loyal admiration, a true, though stern love, he received. He was looked up to by those around him as a feudal chief of an intellectual and spiritual sort. Yet there are times when the inner fountain of tears bursts out, when wife or friends die, when controversy utterly wearies him, or the battle proves too hard for his poor body, with its constant torture of nine diseases, and for his over-laden soul, with the unlifted burden of many countries and churches. His wife and little dead children are pale, passive figures in his life. Yet, though his home lacks the portrait-like warmth and distinctiveness of Luther's, there was true joy when they were beside him, and a deep pathos in the reformer's heart when he dwelt in his lonely rooms. Certainly, and in full consistency with the books of the man, we never hear, as in Luther's case, of alternate laughter over the cradle, and agony over the coffin, of his little ones; nor, as in Melanchthon's, of being found rocking his child and reading a book at the same time; nor, as in Zwingli's, of his warm love for his heroic wife; nor of a pipe of Bordeaux, which Knox, in dying, humorously wished to be broached. All this is wanting in Calvin. Looking at the two faces, as we see them in true portraits of Luther and Calvin, explains all. In Kranach's Luther—and he never seems done painting him—you have always the same burly figure, bull-like neck, homely Bunyan-like face, with marked brows, vivid eyes looking out or up, and firm, eloquent mouth, with outstretched hands. In the portrait of Calvin all is different, and perhaps there are not more than one or two portraits of Calvin. You have the spare form; the thin, fur-clad neck; the pale, shrunken cheeks; the compact, high, somewhat narrow brow of two stories—the first the perceptive, the second the reasoning; the long, pointed nose, different from that of Erasmus—his is ever sniffing at things in general, Calvin's is pointing down straight to the very object; the firm, sharp lips; and, above all, the eyes—that Beza tells us remained, after all his midnight studies, brightly and piercingly black till the end—and the long forefinger stretched out with an inevitable accuracy.

Turning from these to the moral character, there is an undisturbed harmony. Few men have ever lived such a one life of purpose and deed: he had no love of self in any shape —of gold, or pleasure, or fame. All were absorbed in the bending and blending of his will into God's. His very irritability, which he frequently and bitterly lamented, was mainly for God's sake, and his sternness was never mean. We cannot help looking on him with a pitying tenderness as well as revering awe. One would have liked in him more of the human, but then we should not have had the Calvin he is; for this was his great character — in spirit, a man of God; in system, emphatically, as Melanchthon called him, the theologian; in work, through and through, devoted to the absolute will of God and the good of His Church.

We have necessarily anticipated, in our hints on the works of Calvin, the nature of their contents; but now let us look more closely at those main points of his teaching which formed their spirit, and through which, in living power, he had, and still has, an immense influence.

The first thing which meets us is what has been called the formal principle of the Reformation — namely, the place he assigns to the authority of the divine Word, as compared with that which Luther gave to the material principle—namely, justification by faith in Christ. Calvin, through the instinct of his mind, sought for the starting-point of theology, not in an inward experience, however divine, but in an outward fact, the Word of God. In this lay the substance of all he taught as doctrine and realised as experience. Planting his foot there, he set aside the whole authority of the Church, and dismissed as vain, apart from the Bible, everything which could not directly relate itself to it or be proved thereby. The Bible to him was, in fact, the consciousness of the Church. Severing thus the rule of faith from Romanism, he severed it also from philosophy; for these two extremes have also their points of junction. Hence, Calvinism moves midway between Romanism and Rationalism. Luther inclined strongly to tradition, and Zwingli to pagan philosophy. Calvin stood clear of both as fountains of truth and foundations of teaching; but the highest proof of the Bible he held to lie, not so much in its miracles or prophecies as in its native nobleness and fitness of doctrine, and in the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit. The Bible, in his eyes,

was a living experience, a divinely-evidenced truth to the soul, a perpetual and prolonged revelation of God. When he advances to the doctrine of justification by faith, the living Christ in the heart, we have the same comprehensive and reconciling tendency—he links together by one stroke the faith that justifies and the faith that regenerates and renews. The inward feeling and the outward fruit are thus one life, and a holy character is laid as deep in the very being of faith as a pacified conscience. It is the one act which receives a whole Christ. Legalism on the one side, and Antinomianism on the other, are excluded, simply by the complete statement of the truth.

But the doctrine which gives character and colour to Calvin's system is that of sovereign grace. The manner of a man's conversation has a determining influence in shaping the method of his creed. It was so with Calvin. Will was his differential quality, and the great change in him was submission to an almighty and all-holy Will. This was the cell-form of doctrine out of which its whole organisation afterwards developed. Whatever are the statements of Calvin on this great theme, it is ever to be remembered that they are essentially those of Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon in his first period, of Anselm and Augustine, and especially of Paul their master; and (as a strange and sharp proof of the existence of such a truth as a need for a revived Christianity), of Schleiermacher, though with his somewhat pantheistic rendering, in the nineteenth century.

Pelagianism deadens, never revives or strengthens, the Church. In a crisis of revival, Augustinianism—the exaltation of the divine side of salvation in grace and redemption—asserts itself in spirit and essence, however it may be expressed in words. Even the Arminianism of the Wesleyans is closer in spirit to the latter than it is to the former. Moreover, it is a side of doctrine which emerges in every statement of the essential relations of the human and the divine will. It is hard to find room for both in the forms of human thought, and harder still to verify the working of both without a sacrifice or dilution of either. And when the insoluble difficulty of the relation of the human and the divine will, of man's responsibility and God's prescience or predestination (for these are practically the same), is intensified by the additional and more painful difficulty of man's sinful will and God's saving act—then a complication ensues which forces from us the old cry of

Paul, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!" It makes us turn, in the impotence of our understanding, to the beseeching of men by the mercies of God. After all, it is the existence of sin which, as it shatters philosophy, so it perplexes theology, and makes man a contradiction. The real knot of the unloosed difficulty centres not so much in making room for both free will and omnipotence, as in making room for man's sin and God's wisdom, holiness, and, above all, love, in the same sphere. But this difficulty lies not in Calvinism nor in any Christian scheme of doctrine, but in all Theism, and especially in every phase of Christian Theism where sin is really acknowledged and the absolute need of grace admitted.

To this essential difficulty, however, it must be admitted that Calvin has added, or seems to add, some difficulties of his own making. The first touches the extension of predestination. I shall not speak of his exclusion of infants. Few modern Calvinists would follow him in the uninterrupted severity of his deductions on that point. Nor, secondly, shall I dwell on the other extension of the electing act, as including reprobation or a positive direct rejection of the sinful. I do not suppose Calvin himself believed this when put in an unmodified form. Still, in his anxiety to make room for the divine sovereign will, he falls into, and insists on, statements with which we cannot agree. Of course, even he, in the long run, is compelled to make room for a responsible human will, and a freedom in that will which follows indeed a corrupt nature, but does so as a will, freely, and from within. It was at this point that Melanchthon tried to lift off the pressure, so as to add a certain equal co-working of the human will which should act, though not by its unaided causation or in the outcome of human merit. There also, I believe, he erred. The end of all human thought on this haunting and baffling problem is always the same, that as in the original, so now in the complex position of this insoluble problem, we must admit a genuine predestination which vindicates grace; and yet, amidst all limits, whether in the creation or the corruption of man, a genuine freedom which verifies responsibility. Where the third truth lies, is beyond human knowledge and skill. Enough, the indestructible facts of divine grace in its infinite fulness, and of human responsi-

bility in its lowest estate, remain. The speculative reconciliation is in God; the practical is ours.

There is another point—not relating to doctrine, but to tone—which I cannot pass by. No doubt, as all is from God, so all will be to His glory; yet, I confess it is a hard trial in reading Calvin to mark—even to have forced upon the attention—the unmoved, almost triumphant, tone in which he pronounces sentence upon these mysteries, not only of divine knowledge but of human misery. I had much rather have, in contemplating this awful side of truth, the feelings of John Duncan, of whom we read, "Speaking to a friend with great tenderness of the ancient philosophers, who knew no Saviour, though they almost cried for one, and pacing up and down the room he said, 'My heart bleeds for Plato.'"

Passing by his doctrine of the sacraments; the principle which has made Calvinism vitally and lastingly powerful, as much as, if not more, than the doctrine of predestination, is his doctrine of the Church. This, too, has close relations to his doctrine of sovereign grace, for it connected each member of the Church in absolute dependence upon God, and so made all independent of a clerical priesthood—all being priests in the Christian sense, and all forming a Church with a government independent of any other government. The equality of believers, their ecclesiastical office-bearers being only their ministers by their choice, for Christ's sake, and to carry out Christ's will and work; the union of churches with presbyterian order and authority; and the independence of believers, spiritually and ecclesiastically, of all external authority—these three principles are the greatest practical victories of Calvin, which belong to him, as to none of the reformers except John Knox, and which give the Christian Church freedom, both within and without, from priest and from prince.

Such are the main points of his system. We need not dwell on its excellences,—its elevating all to a divine height and origin,—its clear assurance of individual salvation through Christ,—its rooting deep in the grace of God the independence of each soul from every other, and of the community of Christian souls from all external pressure,—and its supreme end of personal holiness, and ecclesiastical discipline and doctrine as the means towards this end. Nor need I detain you upon

its defects, at which I have already hinted. But they are mainly two: the first, the putting of a divine secret decree in the foreground, instead of the divine declared love in Jesus Christ; putting the unscaleable mountain of mystery and power before the soul, instead of the open pastures of redeeming grace; and the second, like unto it on the other side of the system, the asserting of punishment, even to death, to enforce the discipline of the Christian Church. I mention this the more expressly, lest it should be thought that I had forgotten Servetus and his tragic end. But when I mention it, I must add that the blame thrown upon Calvin is most unrighteously one-sided. There was no man of that day, Romanist or Libertine, who would not have done the same—Luther, perhaps, excepted, and that only because of his instincts and against his principles. Servetus himself would have burnt Calvin, according to his own teaching in the *Christianismi Restitutio*. As well condemn Sir Matthew Hale as a monster of injustice because he sentenced witches to be burned, as Calvin for taking part, and that a mitigating one, in the execution of Servetus.

But why plead in any wise for Calvin or Calvinism? Their works praise them in the gate, and speak for both. Never since the beginning of Christianity has any man or system produced such immense, heavenly, and heroic fruits. That great mountain has sheltered many a valley, shaped by its rise and lying at its foot. That deep digging and ploughing has made fruitful many a barren place. That fountain of divine grace has parted into a fourfold river, and made paradise on every side. Nearly all the heroisms, most of the liberties, much of the highest wisdom and character of these three hundred years, trace themselves back straight to that lonely man. The children of his home died and left him solitary; the children of his spirit grew to be a mighty nation. The last and best biographer of Calvin, Kampschulte, points out that his reformation is the only one that steps beyond the limits of its birthplace. Huss was more a political and Bohemian reformer. Luther's reformation, while deeply Christian, having its roots nourished by relations to his "dear German nation," has never struck kindly in any other soil. Calvin, living in Geneva, a free city, put off the Frenchman as he put off the Romanist, and came forth in his system a man and a Christian.

From his hands the Reformation became a movement independent of nationality, and produced a truly Christian and Catholic Church. Hence the breath and breadth of his influence has touched all orders of mind. The highest in genius and culture rise in their mien of soul and measure of praise as they look up to him; and many a peasant, with God's grace stirring mightily within amidst a poor lot and dreary toils, has felt the bracing air of his stern doctrine and noble aims. Pass out from Geneva. See how he moved through and joined together the Swiss Reformed Churches, and had all but gained over into union the German Reformation also. See how, though he never revisited his old France, yet his soul marched on at the head of the Huguenots, and, but for black St Bartholomew, would have made France the central Christian power in Europe. See how in France, also, a hundred years after, it was his truth, indirectly felt, that roused the grand and saintly spirits of Port-Royal. These two men, Calvin and Pascal, have lifted up the French mind out of its usual charm into an unwonted sublimity. In Holland, Calvin gave a body to the meditations which had been cherished by Thomas à Kempis in the serene air of his monastery, and created its noble army of 36,000 martyrs. Calvin's voice, in his letters, was a word as from an emperor; and when about to die, they saluted him. Ten years of added life to Edward VI., and Calvin, in his reformation, would have shaped English Christianity, and saved us from a conflict which is again deepening around us at this hour. As it was, he was the teacher and inspirer of the Puritans; and men like Oliver Cromwell and John Milton, John Bunyan and John Howe, and though differing in opinion, yet like in spirit, Richard Hooker, can answer well for the nobleness and beauty of souls who surrender themselves to divine grace. Shall we forget to call Scotland to bear testimony? John Knox was, as Guizot says, no disciple of Calvin, but an equal; yet he learned much from him, and Scotland to this hour owes much of its Reformation to the sovereign intellect and example of Calvin. And was not the whole covenanting struggle one for divine grace, spiritual independence, and human liberty? Our own old Secession and Relief Churches called no man master but Christ, yet they looked up to Calvin as one of His best scholars; and in later years, under Chalmers, and in a revived Christianity,

and the Free Church, the old truth has given new tokens of its undying power. In Germany, also, the only system which has broken up rationalism is that of Schleiermacher, which asserts, though with many defects, the person of Christ and the power of grace. But time would fail to tell of all the victories of this truth. It is the great spiritual force at this moment in America; for the Pilgrim Fathers carried Calvin with them, and it still lives in strength amid thousands of churches, and has been embodied afresh, and with marvellous skill and learning, in the great book of Charles Hodge, the patriarch of Presbyterianism. And, away in far-off islands of the seas, and in continents to east and west, these principles rescue multitudes at this hour from heathenism, and bear fruit in homes of purity and churches of God.

I venture, then, to claim for Calvinism, or rather the Christianity which it in good measure represents, a power no future age can exhaust. Its difficulties, after all, lie in its high thoughts and holy living; and these, while they awe and sometimes repel, at last attract and win men. The future of the Church and the world is contended for by these three—Romanism, Rationalism, and pure Christianity. I have no fear for the issue. There may be swayings to and fro over the wide battle-field of contest; but I am sure that the army that has deep convictions of sin, and lofty views of God and His grace, has elements of intellectual truth, moral power, and divine reinforcement which shall gain the day. These elements shall emerge after every failure, and at last stand fast and for ever. These are truest to God and to man, for God's praise and for man's good; and these meet in Him Who has redeemed man from his lowest sin, by that death on the cross in which He has revealed God in His highest glory.

WM. GRAHAM.

# AMERICAN QUARTERLIES.

1. *The New Englander.* New Haven. January 1874.
2. *The Bibliotheca Sacra.* Andover. January 1874.
3. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review.* New York. January 1874.

1. *The New Englander* contains a brief but deeply interesting account of "Armenia and the Armenians," by Mr Trowbridge of Marash, in Turkey. The special object of the paper is to direct attention to the wonderful progress that has been made through the labours of American missionaries among the Armenians. The first American missionaries to Palestine were sent out in 1821. When at Jerusalem their attention was arrested by a class of pilgrims of whom they had not before heard, "good-looking men, with black hair and dark eyes, and with thoughtful intelligent faces." These pilgrims were from Armenia, and thus the way was providentially opened to the American churches for entering on that great missionary enterprise among the Armenians which has been so signally blessed. It was not, however, till 1831, that the first missionary was sent out to begin his labour in Constantinople. A wonderful change has been effected. In the following sentences the writer briefly sums up the results of forty years' labour:

"At the end of 1871, we find there are 76 Evangelical Churches among the Armenians, with 4032 church members; that there are 50 ordained native pastors, and 56 educated licensed preachers; that 222 common schools contain 5080 scholars, and that the number of registered Protestants has increased to 19,471; that there are 202 places where the gospel is regularly preached, and that 128 Sabbath schools are attended each Sabbath by over 8000 persons. We find that during the ten years, from 1861 to 1871, 305,700 copies of the Bible, and portions of the Bible, have been sold in Turkey. We find that the whole number of bound volumes issued from the press from the time of its first establishment, is 711,700, besides all the books and tracts published in the languages of Turkey by the Bible and Tract Societies of England and America. We find four schools for the training of young men for the ministry, at Marsovan, Harpoot, Mardiss, and Marash; that there are eleven well-organised schools exclusively for the education of girls, under the care of ladies from America, and that in those schools several hundred Armenian girls are fitting themselves to exert a silent but mighty influence in the work of reformation."

Dr Patton, of Chicago, presents a very important and seasonable article on "Revivals of Religion," with special reference to the question how to make them productive of permanent good. He directs attention to the importance of keeping in view the divine authorship of all true revivals of religion, and, at the same time, of recognising the fact that revivals coming in the line of spiritual causation involve human agency, and therefore varied methods and attendant imperfections. Dr Patton very judiciously illustrates the truths which the friends of revivals are some-

times prone to forget, that, however precious in their results, they cover only a part of the ground either of divine action or of the religious life and work of the church. "Evolutionism *versus* Theism," is an ably written paper, designed to shew that Evolutionism within certain limits is not contrary to Theism. This is a subject which has not yet been fully discussed. But "let the fight go on all over the field, we know the right shall prevail." "The Relation of the Church of England to the other Protestant Churches" is a remarkably able historical exposition of the subject, by Professor Fisher, of Yale. Certain High Church ecclesiastics in America had incautiously brought themselves into controversy with him on this point. The following extract, though long, will be pardoned for the interest of the subject to readers on this side:

"The Church of England," says Dr Fisher, "is now tasting the fruit of error in the past. On three great occasions, at least, golden opportunities for a larger comprehension were presented, and these opportunities were cast away. The first was at the accession of James I., when the Millenary Petitions was offered, and when, at the Hampton Court Conference, to the unspeakable delight of a knot of partisan and sycophantic bishops, that 'Solomon of the age' bullied the Puritans. The second was at the restoration of the throne at the accession of Charles II., when his most solemn pledges were violated, and when the Savoy Conference was attended by another victory of a bigoted faction. The third was at the Revolution, when the same faction, aided by peculiar circumstances, gained another triumph. At both of these last epochs, the noblest and wisest men of the clergy and laity were advocates of a liberal policy. Now nearly half of the English nation is arrayed in hostility to the National Church. If the Church of England should be disestablished, it would most probably be divided. It is hardly possible that the party which cleaves to the Judaising type of religion, which is an heirloom from Pharisaism, and is an eternal foe of the gospel, should abide in the same communion with the adherents of the principles of the Reformation. The Ritualists, with their candles, 'their flexions and genuflexions,' their elevation of ceremonies above truth and godliness, will form a church by themselves, or go back to the Pope where they belong. Under the present circumstances, the signs of the times being what they are, and when the Romanising factions are active, it is not strange that enlightened men of the Low Church and Broad Church parties should be inclined to draw closer to the other Protestant bodies which hold the same faith, and should desire to see the Church of England abandon the habit of seclusion, which is not required by her constitution, but which was forced upon her in the servile days of the Stuarts, and resume her old position by the side of her sisters of the Reformation."

2. *The Bibliotheca Sacra* contains as usual a variety of very able papers. Dr Hill, late President of Harvard College, discusses with great critical acumen, and in a most satisfactory manner, "Theology as a Possible Science." Positivists of the school of Comte, and those who maintain that man, as a finite being, cannot lay hold on the Infinite, and hence that the attributes of the Infinite and Absolute Cause of the universe must for ever be unknown and unknowable, of course reject theology altogether as a science. Sir William Hamilton, in propounding his "Law of the Conditioned," devoutly recognised, it is true, the existence of the Infinite God, but he claimed that recognition as an act of faith or belief, and not of knowledge. Though he did not deduce Atheistic corollaries

from his "Law of the Conditioned," yet this has been done by others. Dr Hill criticises these diverse systems of philosophy, and shews the defects on Kant's distinction between the pure and practical reason; of Hamilton's between the cognitive faculties and faith; Mansel's between speculative and regulative truth; and of the metaphysical speculations of Spencer and Mill in their bearing on this subject, and completely vindicates for theology a place among the sciences. The paper is a valuable contribution to modern apologetics.

Mr Merrill, of Andover, the author of articles on "Christ an observer of Nature, Persons, and Events," to which we have already directed the attention of our readers, has here a full and painstaking paper on "Galilee in the time of Christ." With remarkable industry and skill he has collected and arranged all the facts that may throw light on the actual conditions of Galilee at the time of our Lord's public ministry in that region. We hope to be able to transfer this article to our pages in a future number.

Dr Rich, on "The Hebrew Tense," presents a scholarly exposition of the fact that the Hebrew language has only two tenses—the past and the future—and the rules determining their use. We give his results:

(1.) The *past* may be used to denote a future action or event, when that action or event is one that has been decided upon in the plan and purposes of God. (2.) The absolute future also under certain circumstances may be used to denote a past act. This is especially true of customary acts. It is implied that they will be done in the future. (3.) The future is used in describing a past act that followed some other past act or event which is expressed by a preterite. It was in the future when the former event occurred, though both alike were in the past at the time of the narration. (4.) The *present* is simply the point where the past and the future touch each other. Each of these tenses was employed as a present. (*a*) When the act was conceived of, as related to the past, the preterite would more naturally be employed. This form is used in speaking of that which is *habitual*, and in stating *general* truths. (*b*) If, on the other hand, the action was conceived of as standing in relation with the *future*, this tense would probably be used. It may be employed to denote not only that which is occurring or true *now*, but that which will occur and be true in the future. By their *relative past* (formed by prefixing *vav* to the future absolute), and the relative future (formed by prefixing *vav* to the absolute past), the Hebrews could denote an act subsequent to another act, whether past, present, or future. The *time* of the relative tenses will, in every instance, be derived from the absolute of which they depend, and, like the march of time, they always look forward, never backward."

Dr Thomson (of "The Land and the Book") continues his articles on "The Natural Basis of our Spiritual Language." This paper treats of the basis of the "Divine Names and Titles" found in the physical features of Palestine, and in incidents in the personal history of David and of other writers by whom these names were used. The only other paper requiring to be mentioned here is on "Natural Realism; or, Faith the Basis of Science and Religion," a calm and able discussion of the first part of this subject.

3. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review.* Dr Aiken, of

Princeton, criticises Arnold's *Literature and Dogma*, ably exposing its pretentiousness. An article on "The Sinfulness of Selfishness," by Dr Hickok, presents a clear and comprehensive view of the subject. After defining selfishness according to the scriptural standard, he shews its sinfulness, (1.) in that it changes as self-interest prompts; (2.) extinguishes all reverence for authority; (3.) and unchecked, will desolate the moral universe.

Dr Noble, of Pittsburg, discusses "Obedience and Liberty" in a lengthened but very admirable paper. It is an old theological question revived under a new aspect. The conclusion which the writer reaches is:

"Obedience to God is, in no true sense a bondage, but a real liberty of soul." . . . "In every respect and relation of it, obedience works towards freedom. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there, in more than one sense, in all true senses, is liberty. Truth emancipates; none so effectually and fully as the truth of Christ. So we may catch up the old strain and say, in the interest of liberty as well as of conscience, 'It is better to obey God than men, even though the men be ourselves.'"

Among the remaining articles there is one on "The Late Commercial Crisis," by Dr Atwater, in which he brings out the ethical principles applicable to mercantile speculations.

"Our recent troubles," he says, "would have been altogether avoided had these simple moral maxims been heeded. The old way of thriving by earnest industry, careful savings, prudent investments, and gradual accumulations, and paying as we go, will in the long run, and on the largest scale, prove to be one of wisdom's ways which are ways of pleasantness. The contrary way too often ends in those wrecks which lie stranded in melancholy profusion all around us."

Mr Leyburn, a missionary to Greece, endeavours to vindicate the modern Greeks against the bad opinions of them so long prevalent, maintaining that they inherit many of the noble qualities of their renowned ancestors. A translation from the *Revue des Deux Mondes* on "The Sense of the Beautiful in Brutes," viewed in relation to psychological Darwinism and comparative psychology, exposes the feeble side of the theory of evolutionism. M. G. E.

## GERMAN PERIODICALS.

*Studien und Kritiken.* 1874. Nos. I. and II.

The issue of the *Studien und Kritiken* for the present year opens with a long biographical paper, in which Dr Riehm sketches the life and labours of his late fellow-editor, Professor Hundeshagen of Bonn, a man distinguished not only for his admirable writings, but by the zeal and ability with which he threw himself into all questions affecting the life of the Church. It is striking to find that the practical interest in Church organisation and Church government, which characterised Hundeshagen in so unusual a degree, stood in the closest relation to the fact that he was thoroughly a man of the Reformed, as distinguished from the Lutheran type. It was at Bern, where he was professor for many years, that he first saw the old ecclesiastical life of the Swiss Reformed Churches

as a thing still preserved and still valuable. There he learned to supplement the one-sided intellectual and *doctrinaire* interests of the German Universities by a more practical apprehension of Church problems, which did not forsake him after his return to Heidelberg. It will be remembered that probably the most valuable of Hundeshagen's writings is his essay on the Reformation-work of Zwingli, or the Theocracy in Zürich.

Dr Beyschlag contributes a paper on "The Epistle of James as a Monument of the earliest Christianity,"—not proposing any new theory, but carrying out the defence of the genuineness of the epistle in the line first marked out by Schneckenburger, and farther developed by many other critics. The main occasion of the paper is, that the genuineness—which, after the unsatisfactory destructive arguments of Baur and Schwegler, began to gain general recognition—is again sharply attacked by Grimm and Hilgenfeld, and that Holtzmann, too, is now disposed to fall back from the middle ground which he once held. Dr Beyschlag examines the alleged proofs of dependence of the epistle on other New Testament writings, denies that there is any polemic against Paul, and maintains that the type of the epistle is earlier than Paulinism, both as regards doctrine, and from the fact that it supposes a state of things in which there were only Jewish Christians in the districts addressed, and when these had not altogether separated themselves from connection with the Synagogue and dependence on the richer of their unconverted brethren. This view is worked out with considerable literary power, and the article closes with an attempt to argue from the character of James to the characteristics of the circle in which our Lord Himself was brought up.

The part of the number assigned to shorter papers is occupied by some remarks by Von Muralt on the Firkowitsch MSS. at St Petersburg, with notes and closing observations by Riehm. The latter deal mainly with the eras involved in the dates of the MSS. Muralt's communication is of a somewhat general kind, and can hardly claim any value, since Dr Strack has undertaken a thorough examination of the codices.

In the second number, Dr John Delitzsch, son of the celebrated Leipzig Professor, discusses the source of the earliest traditions about Simon Peter and Simon Magus at Rome. The Simon Magus of the Pseudo-clementine writings is admittedly an Ebionite caricature of Paul. Hence the Tübingen critics argue that the whole figure of Simon is fictitious; that even in the Book of Acts he appears only in order that the Ebionite view may be opposed by distinguishing him from Paul. Now the tradition about Simon in its full form represents Peter as following him to Rome, and finally vanquishing him there. And this, say Lipsius and others, is the earliest form of the tradition connecting Peter with Rome, whence it follows that the whole tradition of a Roman residence of the apostle is as empty a fiction as the person of Simon Magus. This view is not, however, shared by the whole school. Hilgenfeld, while he gives up Simon as a pure fiction, still holds that an independent and sound tradition connects the martyrdom of Peter with Rome. Delitzsch goes further, and seeks to shew that the early fathers had, quite

apart from the Ebionite caricature, independent traditions about Peter in Rome and Simon Magus in Rome, though not about a conflict of the two. He also tries to shew that the early fathers not only did not, but could not, borrow from the Ebionite legends anything about a Roman residence either of Peter or of Simon; that, in fact, these legends in their earlier shape confined the conflict of the apostle and the impostor to the East. The arguments on both sides are intricate, and a brief reply which Hilgenfeld has already given to the paper in his own journal, shews no inclination to compromise.

A long discussion, by Kähler, of Romans ii. 14–16, is framed with reference to recent commentaries, but mainly opposes the arguments and results of Michelsen, published in the *Studien* last year, and already described in our pages. Kähler maintains that the apostle does recognise that at least in individual cases heathen men produce actions really accordant with the law, and thus vindicate for themselves a real acquaintance with the demands of that law of which the Jews boast themselves exclusive possessors. The paper strictly limits itself to this exegetical result, declining to deal with the problems of Biblical or Dogmatic Theology which spring from it.

In the shorter papers, the question of the date of Luther's birth again comes up, of course without any issue being reached on a point as to which Luther himself held different beliefs at different periods of his life. More interesting are several notes, by Schrader, giving illustrations of Biblical topics from Assyrian sources. The first of these notes refers to the much discussed passage, Amos v. 26. Professor Schrader urges that the now current exegesis which makes סכות and כיון common nouns is unsuitable, while two proper names are quite in place. That Kaivân, in Arabic, is Saturn, has long been known. The same name for the planet is now found in Assyrian, so that we seem quite justified in taking the second of these disputed words in this sense, pronouncing כִּיוָן. The chief difficulty hitherto felt in this view lay in the absence of a corresponding god for the companion word סִכּוּת. But a syllabar, published by Rawlinson, gives Sak-kut = Adar, that is, Adrammelech, who is also identified with the planet Saturn. The name, according to the Assyrian use of the root = terrible. Schrader then proposes to transpose צלמיכם as the LXX apparently read, and to translate, "So ye shall take up Sakkuth, your king, and Kevan, your stargod, your images which," &c. Of course this identification of the words with the names of Assyrian deities forms one more argument against the certainly false, but not yet extinct view which makes the verse refer to idolatry in the wilderness of wandering. The thought is as Isaiah xlvi. 2.

The second note deals with Baal and Bel. Baal is primarily an appellative of any deity, but as a proper name is the sun-god. It has therefore been generally assumed that the Bel of Babylon and Assyria was also the sun-god. This now appears to be incorrect. The Assyrian sun-god is Samas, and Bel is a quite distinct deity, whose origin is not yet made out. When the Assyrian Bel appears on West Semitic ground he is distinguished as Belitan = Old Bel. Of course, it is not surprising that a name originally = Lord, should, in different countries, have been appro-

priated to different gods. The appellative force of the word remains in Bel-Merodach = Jupiter, who is neither Bel proper, nor Baal.

Finally, we have a discussion of the Babylonian origin of the week of seven days. It is argued that the number seven had no early sanctity among the Arabs, and that both they and the Abyssinians adopted the seven-day week pretty late. If the week, then, was not from the first common Semitic property, it must, says Schrader, have come from the Babylonians, who are the originators of all astronomical lore in Western Asia, and who, in fact, according to the inscriptions, often enumerate the seven planets in the very order in which the days of the week are derived from them. The Jews had not the custom of naming the days by the planets, but the Arameans, it is urged, must have derived these names from Babylon, and transmitted them to the Romans. This paper contains much information, but it is not well reasoned out, several vital points being omitted. One wishes to know whether the week was based on the knowledge of the seven planets, or whether rather the names of the planets were attached at a later time to the week. Dr Schrader himself seems to judge that the week was originally got at by quartering the lunar month. If so, was it only because they were not idolaters that the Hebrews had not the planetary names? May not rather these names have been later? The order of the planets, as applied to the days of the week, implies not only a good deal of accurate astronomical knowledge, but also, if I mistake not, the usage of a day of twenty-four hours.[1] Nor does Dr Schrader say that he has found in the inscriptions the habit of naming the days by the planets, but only the seven planets themselves in the right order. W. R. S.

---

## NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

### Philosophy and Theology.

*An Outline Study of Man; or, The Body and Mind in one System. With Illustrative Diagrams, and a Method for Blackboard Teaching.* By Mark Hopkins, D.D., LL.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1873.

The author of this book "believes in no transcendental metaphysics which are not capable of being communicated in good English, and of being understood by any man of good common sense:" nay, he believes that "it is possible to present the most abstract and difficult questions of metaphysics, so that they shall be interesting and profitable to a popular audience." His book is meant to furnish actual proof of these positions. The idea of using diagrams and a blackboard in metaphysical teaching is somewhat novel, and will, for many minds, be sufficient at once to proclaim the above book to emanate from America; but this is

[1] I have not access to a paper by Brandis to which Dr Schrader refers for information on this topic, but certainly the usual astrological doctrine on the matter involves the day of twenty-four hours.

the author's great secret of making abstruse questions interesting, and obscure distinctions intelligible. Having read, not yet the whole of this book, but having read it largely, we have found the diagrams unquestionably useful in creating interest and in making the meaning clear. It deals little with metaphysics proper, and may be characterised as a descriptive psychology. Apart from the diagrams, there is nothing in the book very hard to understand, while we cannot object to this additional aid, as clearness can never be in excess. We can cordially recommend the book as an introduction to psychological studies, and as an excellent preparatory training in habits of analysis and discrimination. The author's positions seem in the main sound and well-established; he believes neither in Evolution nor Sensationalism nor Materialism.

W. S.

## Old Testament Exegesis.

*The Book of Jonah: The Text Analysed, Translated, and the Accents named; being an Easy Introduction to the Hebrew Language.* By the Rev. Alex. Mitchell, M.A., North Parish, Dunfermline. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1873.

Mr Mitchell is of opinion, that by the study of constantly recurring concrete examples, the leading principles of Hebrew grammar may be impressed on the mind of the learner with greater ease than is possible when they are communicated in the form of abstract statements or rules. In this analysis of the Book of Jonah, he has attempted to furnish a manual for the purpose indicated; and, from the very thorough manner in which he has done his work, we are convinced that it will be found peculiarly useful, particularly to those who may be unable to obtain the aid of a teacher. The grammatical portion of the book is prefaced by a short account of Hebrew accentuation, and a literal translation of the text, which is clear and accurate, though we think in several instances the Hebrew has not been represented by the most expressive English equivalent. Then each word is separately taken and carefully analysed; its pronunciation is indicated in English letters; the meaning in the passage, and also a full lexical account of its general usage are given; while its accentuation and relation to the structure of the sentence are lucidly explained. If Mr Mitchell errs at all, it is on the side of excessive minuteness; and, in our opinion, it would have been better not to burden beginners, for whom the book is intended, with so much information about the names and powers of the minor accents, seeing it is of little or no immediate service to them. At the same time, the most valuable feature of this production is the detailed exhibition and ample elucidation of the great laws of the language, wherever these are illustrated in the form or structural connection of the words discussed. The printing is beautifully executed, and the matter neatly arranged, so that altogether this is one of the most successful works of the sort we have seen.

W. G. E.

*A Commentary on Ecclesiastes.* By the Rev. THOMAS PELHAM DALE, M.A. Rivingtons. London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1873.

An attempt to furnish a sufficient and satisfactory interpretation of *Ecclesiastes* in a small volume of not more than 116 pages of good-sized type, may count on a kindly reception from all who have experienced that weariness of the flesh, which results from being compelled to toil through the masses of unnecessary information with which Commentaries, on much less difficult books of Scripture, are usually encumbered. Still, even the rare and welcome virtue of brevity will not atone for defects in the performance; and therefore our approval of the writer's resolute adherence to conciseness must not prevent us from indicating what we consider serious faults of execution.

The plan of this Commentary is somewhat peculiar. On the upper part of the left hand page we find the authorised version reproduced; while, in the corresponding portion of the right hand page, we have a paraphrase by the author. The lower portions of both pages are occupied by a literal translation printed in black type, which is interspersed by small type notes (in brackets), dealing with points of grammar, rendering, &c. We should have very much preferred to see the Hebrew text in place of the authorised version, and even the paraphrase, though not without its merits, might have been dispensed with. Indeed, we know no pleasanter style of Commentary than that which prints the text at the top of the page, and gives below a literal but expressive translation, interspersed by notes which confine themselves to supplying only needful information. This is the sort of book wanted by those who do not wish to have all the work done for them, but merely to get serviceable aid in doing it.

We have still to speak of the manner in which our author has carried his plan into execution. The paraphrase, which (to use his own words) is to be regarded as an English Targum on the text, must have received a great amount of care and thought, for it has been ingeniously constructed to represent the characteristic features of the original so closely as even to reproduce equivoques and alliterations where these occur. Perhaps, partly in consequence of this tendency, it has a stilted and unnatural character, and presents some singular specimens of English composition. Unfortunately, too, it is very frequently the case that we cannot assent to the writer's conception of the meaning of the text. In our opinion, he frequently misses the real point of an expression, while too often his own renderings are artificial and fanciful. Indeed, he displays an amount of ingenuity (if we may use the phrase) worthy of a better cause. For example, he translates "under the sun" by the expression, "in this hot, work-day world;" and, instead of simply treating it as a phrase, lending emphasis to a statement by the expression of universality, he holds that the preacher employs it for the orthodox purpose of "carefully limiting his statements to this sublunary existence only." Again, some very far-fetched guesses at the sense may be found in his renderings of ii. 3, 12, 21, and elsewhere; while his version of x. 10, on which he specially plumes himself, is altogether improbable and quite tasteless when com-

ed with the more natural meaning proposed by Ewald. Of course, in cases where the meaning is not accurately represented in the para-ase, it is also missed in the literal translation. But even where this ter is quite accurate, we think Mr Dale has committed a mistake in king it "literal even to utter baldness" (to quote his own words). example, to reproduce the well-known Hebrew idiom, "Every man hom God has given," &c., so slavishly as "All the man which gives him God," &c., might be useful if the book were meant as a First brew Reader; but to those for whom it is intended, such literalness is ply a nuisance and vexation of spirit.

he same mental tendencies which manifest themselves in the transla-and paraphrase, appear likewise in the character of the notes. In a f preface, Mr Dale tells us that he has for many years made Ecclesiastes sole subject of his Greek and Hebrew studies. Possibly this has ed him to unduly magnify insignificant phenomena, and devote at he calls) "microscopic attention" to distinctions so fine as to be metimes imaginary. But we cannot help thinking that he has also ed to study sufficiently the leading Hebrew grammarians, and has s been guided too much by his own conjectures drawn from insuffi-nt data. Our author devotes one section of the Introduction to the tement of a number of grammatical peculiarities of Ecclesiastes, on ich he places the greatest weight. Now, many of these are either vial and commonplace, or very far from being well grounded. For mple, he has discovered that the Preacher never uses the two forms the relative indiscriminately; the contracted form always refers to the rd only which it joins, and gives a subjunctive or optative meaning, ile the full relative refers back to the whole clause. One of many mples which shew this theory to be imaginary, is to be found in v. 17 ) of authorised version), where both forms are used with reference to rticular words. How much more natural is the explanation given in vald's Grammar, namely, that the contracted form is used where the iefest expression is most suitable, and in cases of repeated occurrence two forms are alternated for euphony. Unfortunately this and eral other small distinctions seem to have bulked unduly in our hor's mind, so that they are constantly "pointed out in the notes, haps some may imagine pressed too far, and repeated *ad nauseam.*" s presentiment is not altogether unfounded. Consequently, while ty of the notes are useful, or at least clever and plausible, a consider-portion is quite trifling and unserviceable. Further, here and there find notes which must have been either carelessly penned or betray nequal knowledge of Hebrew grammar. Thus, the occurrence in 2, of the interrog. relative *meh*, occasions the remark that we have, m. xx. 10, *mah;* Gen. iv. 10, *meh;* both forms being similar in use." his statement is merely intended to express that both forms mean t, then it is totally unnecessary. But if it means that the pointing matter of indifference, then Mr Dale must have forgotten the principle ccordance with which the Kamets of the first instance is essential re the weak consonant Resh.

ne of the most characteristic features of these notes is the large use

made of the ancient versions, and especially of the LXX, to which Mr Dale attaches the highest importance. In comparing and weighing the renderings of these old translations, and in accounting for the singular variations which often appear, he exhibits very extensive information and an amount of painstaking ingenuity which is often exceedingly interesting. The Introduction, which refrains from discussing the questions of authorship, date, &c., and is mainly intended to give practical guidance in estimating the interpretation, is brief, and to the point; while it contains a number of useful hints and suggestions. On the whole, we fear that our author has been premature in publishing the results of his studies on this puzzling book. For the probability is, that his tendency to indulge in crotchets, and his taste for fanciful renderings, would have been curbed by mature deliberation, and especially by a full comparison of his own ideas with the best Hebrew grammars. In that case, we are convinced Mr Dale would have done himself more justice, and saved his book from those defects which considerably diminish its value and effectiveness. W. G. E.

*An Introductory Hebrew Grammar, with Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing.* By A. B. Davidson, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1874. (168 pp. 8vo.)

This excellent little book supplies a want of which all who are interested in the cultivation of Hebrew studies by our students and ministers have long been painfully conscious. The best grammar which it has hitherto been possible to put into the hands of the Hebrew student on his first approach to the language, is unquestionably the text-book of Gesenius, as re-shaped by Rödiger. A more scientific method characterises Ewald's smaller grammar, but only the very best students can be expected to understand the peculiar style of language and thought by which this very able book is marked. If the original is hardly intelligible to German professors, the translation can scarcely be lucid to English students. The grammars which stand by the side of Rödiger and Ewald are, without exception, unsatisfactory, and one or two small books which have gained much currency from their brevity—especially a small manual by Tregelles—are purely mischievous in their influence on the student, attaining simplicity by omissions, not by arrangement, and often omitting just what is most important. Rödiger's, then, has been hitherto the best, or rather, the only possible book. But this grammar has all the faults inseparable from a treatise which has been patched and re-patched through half a century. The original method of Gesenius was purely empirical, and in no way calculated to give the learner an insight into the genius of the Hebrew language, so different from the tongues with which the beginner is already acquainted. Additions, mainly borrowed from Ewald, have partly corrected this defect. But the result, after all, is patchwork, and as in all patchwork, a certain small measure of inaccuracy, and a very large measure of obscurity. In short, the book is serviceable only in connection with the personal instruction of a good

the author's great secret of making abstruse questions interesting, and obscure distinctions intelligible. Having read, not yet the whole of this book, but having read it largely, we have found the diagrams unquestionably useful in creating interest and in making the meaning clear. It deals little with metaphysics proper, and may be characterised as a descriptive psychology. Apart from the diagrams, there is nothing in the book very hard to understand, while we cannot object to this additional aid, as clearness can never be in excess. We can cordially recommend the book as an introduction to psychological studies, and as an excellent preparatory training in habits of analysis and discrimination. The author's positions seem in the main sound and well-established; he believes neither in Evolution nor Sensationalism nor Materialism.

W. S.

## Old Testament Exegesis.

*The Book of Jonah: The Text Analysed, Translated, and the Accents named; being an Easy Introduction to the Hebrew Language.* By the Rev. Alex. Mitchell, M.A., North Parish, Dunfermline. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1873.

Mr Mitchell is of opinion, that by the study of constantly recurring concrete examples, the leading principles of Hebrew grammar may be impressed on the mind of the learner with greater ease than is possible when they are communicated in the form of abstract statements or rules. In this analysis of the Book of Jonah, he has attempted to furnish a manual for the purpose indicated; and, from the very thorough manner in which he has done his work, we are convinced that it will be found peculiarly useful, particularly to those who may be unable to obtain the aid of a teacher. The grammatical portion of the book is prefaced by a short account of Hebrew accentuation, and a literal translation of the text, which is clear and accurate, though we think in several instances the Hebrew has not been represented by the most expressive English equivalent. Then each word is separately taken and carefully analysed; its pronunciation is indicated in English letters; the meaning in the passage, and also a full lexical account of its general usage are given; while its accentuation and relation to the structure of the sentence are lucidly explained. If Mr Mitchell errs at all, it is on the side of excessive minuteness; and, in our opinion, it would have been better not to burden beginners, for whom the book is intended, with so much information about the names and powers of the minor accents, seeing it is of little or no immediate service to them. At the same time, the most valuable feature of this production is the detailed exhibition and ample elucidation of the great laws of the language, wherever these are illustrated in the form or structural connection of the words discussed. The printing is beautifully executed, and the matter neatly arranged, so that altogether this is one of the most successful works of the sort we have seen.

W. G. E.

both of ignorance and dishonesty, while at the same time considerable light is thrown on several other subjects, such as the present state of the text of the Septuagint and the history of its production. The problem to be solved is this, namely, how, when the apostles have occasion to quote Old Testament Scripture, they, as a rule, conform to the Septuagint version, yet in many instances coincide on the other hand with the Hebrew text, and again sometimes diverge from both. Our author cannot rest content with the assumption that our Lord and His disciples for the most part made use of the Greek language (advocated recently by Dr Roberts of St Andrews), for he holds the evidence to be overpowering that the ordinary speech of Palestine in Christ's day was Aramaic. Neither can he agree with the view that the New Testament authors quoted from memory, inasmuch as he finds in the divergences traces of the operation of a uniform cause, and not of such a haphazard influence as mere variation in accuracy of recollection. Accordingly he comes forward with the hypothesis that the apostles quoted neither from the Hebrew text nor from the Septuagint directly, but from an Aramaic People's Bible, which closely followed the version of the Seventy, and had come into universal use among the unlearned in Palestine.

In defence of his theory, Dr Böhl attempts to extract from the few and questionable utterances of history the real facts regarding the origin and subsequent vicissitudes of the Septuagint. We regret that it is impossible within our limits to follow him in his investigations and indicate where we conceive that he has succeeded and where he has failed. But the result of his historical research is this. The Alexandrine Greek version of the Old Testament was completed prior to the year B.C. 247, and soon acquired great respect. Through the Greek wave, which in the earlier half of the second century (B.C.) swept over Palestine, the Septuagint was introduced, and speedily became very influential, as is clear from the fact that the Samaritan Pentateuch was modelled upon it. But after the reaction set in, and Greek fell into disfavour, just as in Samaria a Chaldæo-Samaritan translation arose, so in Judea it became necessary to prepare for popular use a version in the Aramaic dialect. The translation was made from the Septuagint, though here and there emendations were introduced; and in Christ's day this Syriac Bible was the standard version in Palestine. Finally, as the Aramaic again gave way to the Greek, corresponding to the Samareitikon, this Syriac Bible was re-translated into Greek, and as the text naturally conformed largely with the LXX, the two became amalgamated, and thus originated the present corrupt state of the original text of the Alexandrine version.

In proof of the existence of such a Syriac People's Bible, Dr Böhl brings forward several historical references, and supports his view by other considerations, while he confirms it by shewing how satisfactorily it explains some of the peculiarities of the New Testament quotations; for example, the fact that sometimes all three Synoptists agree in a quotation which differs from both Hebrew and LXX. The whole subject is one of exceeding difficulty, and the history is so meagre and unreliable, that conjecture has largely to be employed. Of course in such a case, the

strength of a hypothesis can only be measured by the completeness with which it accounts for the phenomena ; and, therefore, the above elaborate theory must not be judged by the slight sketch we have been able to give of it. For our own part, we have read Dr Böhl's work with great interest, and are prepared to concede that he has made out a strong presumption in favour of his theory. Still, while we cannot but regard with admiration the ingenious and stately superstructures which he succeeds in erecting on the most scanty historical data, we do not always share in the satisfaction and confidence with which the architect contemplates them. Indeed we should have liked had Dr Böhl been contented with a simpler and less elaborate hypothesis, for in a modified form we conceive that some of the elements of his theory do explain certain of the peculiar features of the quotations, and likewise throw light on several aspects of the literary history of the LXX and the Targum development in Palestine.

Altogether this volume contains, besides a clever and plausible theory of the New Testament quotations, a very extensive store of information admirably arranged and exhibited in an attractive manner. Occasionally the author, in his zeal for effectiveness of style, rather overdoes it ; as, for instance, when he describes Christ's cry, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani, as a "roar of the lion of Judah," and remarks that "the mere sound of the Aramaic words is enough to melt a stone," while no other language could have expressed the same thing. Such blemishes, however, are rare. As a rule the writing is unusually lively, and the descriptions graphic and picturesque, while the reasoning is always lucid and pointed.

W. G. E.

*Records of the Past: Being English Translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments.* Published under the sanction of the Society of Biblical Archæology. Vol. I. London : Bagster.

The *Society of Biblical Archæology* is one of the youngest of the learned bodies of England, but already it has begun to yield good fruit. There was need for such an association to bring to a focus the scattered light which recent oriental research (both into monuments and into language) has shed upon the Old Testament records. The Bible-loving public at large owes thanks to it for having undertaken to issue in a cheap form thoroughly reliable versions of the most important inscriptions hitherto deciphered which bear upon the elucidation of Israelitish annals. The volume before us, which contains texts from the Assyrian tablets, is to be "the first of a series," and we are already promised a second, to contain Egyptian inscriptions. We cannot pretend to judge of these versions from cuneiform writings ; but, being executed by Assyrian scholars like the Rev. Mr Sayce, Mr Fox Talbot, and Sir Henry Rawlinson, they carry the best security for at least such approximate accuracy as the present state of Assyrian scholarship can furnish. The inscriptions are very interesting. They include the only known one of Khammurabi (a king in Babylon long before Abraham's lifetime), which is translatable, being written in the Babylonian language ; one by Shalmaneser's son,

contemporary with Ahab; two which record the reign of Sennacherib including his unsuccessful campaign against Hezekiah; the annals of the great prince, Assurbanipal; and the famous rock inscription of Darius, at Behistun, in which he has pilloried for all time the rebels whose revolts disturbed his reign. Although a quarter of a century has now elapsed since this important monument was completely recovered by the efforts of Major Rawlinson, we are not aware that it has ever till now passed beyond the transactions of the *Royal Asiatic Society* into any more popular or accessible publication. With these historical documents, we find in this little volume reports by the royal astronomers of Babylon; the Accadian Calendar in its Assyrian and Aramaic forms; Sennacherib's will; with specimens of deeds of sale and other mercantile contracts illustrating the trade of the East during the later Jewish kingdom. We wish the Society much success in its attempt to put original evidence of this description within the reach of all Bible students. ED.

## CHURCH HISTORY.

*L'Intolérance de Fénélon: Etudes historiques d'après des documents pour la plupart inédits.* Par O. DOUEN. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher. 1872.

Fénélon, the friend of Madame Guyon, and author of the "Spiritual Letters," has been hitherto regarded by Protestants, not less than Roman Catholics, as an example of benignity and charity, and the "good archbishop of Cambrai" has often been quoted in proof that devotion to the Church of Rome does not necessarily imply a persecuting or intolerant spirit. The author of this book, M. Douen, formerly a Protestant pastor, dispels this illusion. After a minute examination of documents hitherto unknown, he finds Fénélon to have been guilty of aiding and abetting the abduction of young children from their parents, of shutting up Protestant girls in convents against their will, and of putting pressure upon their conscience in order to wring from them an abjuration. Besides this, the archbishop undertook a mission to pervert the Protestants of Saintonge, knowing that he was to act in concert with the dragoons.

The case stood thus:—Fénélon was for ten years (1678-1689) Superior of the house founded in Paris in 1634 for "newly-converted female Catholics." The constitution of this nunnery declares it to be destined "to provide a salutary retreat for young female Protestants against the persecution of their relatives and the artifices of heretics." How these provisions were carried out is thus summed up by Elie Benoit, the historian of the Edict of Nantes:

"It had become so common to kidnap children, and so difficult to obtain justice against the ravishers, that parents dared not lose sight of them, nor allow them to have the slightest communication with Roman Catholics of their own rank. The sign of the cross made by a child of seven or eight years, which had been induced to it by caresses or by little presents, passed as proof of a divine inspiration calling the child to the Roman Catholic religion. This was enough to make them be put into some convent whence it was impossible to obtain their release; and

if a writ was obtained ordering their restitution to their parents, it always happened either that the officers of justice refused to execute it, or, when the children were sought for in the convent to which they had been taken, they could not be found, because the bigots had got them carried elsewhere, and pretended ignorance of the place of their detention."

The following is one specimen out of many of the way in which Protestants *disposed to be converts*, according to the expression of one of Fénélon's biographers, entered the house destined to be a refuge against the persecutions of their relatives. It is a letter from the Marquis of Seignelay to the Lieutenant of Police, dated 24th January 1686 :

"The king knows that the wife of the apothecary Trouillon, of Paris, at present with the duke and duchess de Bouillon, is one of the most obstinate heretics possible ; and as her conversion might bring about that of her husband, His Majesty wishes you to arrest her and take her to the house for newly-converted Catholics, according to the order which I send you."

And on another occasion :

"His Majesty orders me to warn those who refuse to listen to the instructions which are given them, that he will find himself under the necessity of taking measures in regard to them which will not be agreeable to them."

This threat signifies the Bastille or some other prison, or even the public hospital, at that time a den of all sorts of vice. A little later they are ordered "to listen with patience and submission to the instructions which are given them, so as to be ready to join the church fifteen days after their reception into the nunnery."

Several of these poor creatures lost their reason in consequence of this unceasing persecution. In 1686, 224 female Protestants were confined in Paris and at Charenton. Out of those whose names have been preserved, twenty-five abjured into the hands of Fénélon, but eight at least did so only in order to escape out of France ; sixteen were transferred to other convents ; nineteen were sent by the Superior into different chateaux, and treated as state criminals ; ten, who resolved to suffer everything rather than abjure, were expelled from the kingdom as incorrigible ; and twenty-five, who had at first abjured, returned to their former faith, and suffered arrest a second, or (in one case) even a third time. In this instance referred to, the woman was sent to the Château de Loches "to be strictly guarded" till she should make her third abjuration, probably not more sincere than the former ones. It is sad to find Fénélon an active agent in such work. But it is too evident he can no longer be looked on as favouring real toleration. His actions prove the contrary ; and, if there could be any doubt on the subject, his writings would remove it. In one of his *mandements*, he says : "The church . . . must be ready to inflict exemplary punishment on every act of disobedience by persons of intractable disposition. . . . The vigilance and assiduity of the pastor are required to crush the wolves wherever they appear."

It is hardly likely that the man who desired that the Jansenists should be treated as relapsed heretics, that is, should be excommunicated and degraded from their benefices, would shew more mercy to Protestants.

It is true indeed that Fénélon was naturally of a most gentle disposition, and would fain have converted heretics, if he could, without aid from the dragoons; but all history teaches that where a man has once embraced a false or cruel system, he is forced into situations where he must stifle his better feelings, and be content to share the responsibility and the odium of the persecutors.

About the beginning of 1686, Fénélon was sent into Saintonge to preach to the newly-converted Protestants. He came at the heels of the "booted missionaries" to a district where they had been authorised to quarter themselves upon the inhabitants, "pillaging and destroying till they should succeed in converting the whole family." All the Protestants who could not flee into the woods or escape out of the country, succumbed for the time being, and when "the country was pacified," missionaries, such as Bossuet, Fléchier, Bourdaloue, and Fénélon, arrived to receive the new converts into the bosom of the Church." "Father Bourdaloue," writes Madame de Sévigné, "is going, by order of the king, to preach at Montpellier and in those provinces where so many people have been converted, *without their knowing why*.[1] Father Bourdaloue will teach them why." A few extracts from Fénélon's own letters will give an idea of how he accomplished his mission. In his first letter to the Secretary of State, he complains of the bad disposition in which he finds the people and of their desire to leave the country, and begs him "to increase the number of guards at those points where they were likely to pass the frontier." He adds:

"It appears to me that the king's authority ought not to be relaxed in the least, for our arrival in these countries, along with rumours of war coming from Holland, makes the people think that the authorities dread them and are anxious to spare them. The authorities ought to be inflexible in order to keep under control these spirits whom the slightest want of firmness would render insolent. . . . Whilst we are using charity towards them, and the gentleness of instruction, it is important, if I am not mistaken, that those who have authority should uphold it, that the people may the better realise their happiness in being instructed mildly."

It is clear from this that Fénélon held the theory that the civil power ought to use force at the bidding of the Church. From another letter:

"A little visit that the Intendant paid us at Marennes did wonders. . . . Since that time we have found the people more assiduous and docile."

We know what a "visit" from the Intendant meant in those days; fines, imprisonment, confiscation, abduction of children, degradation from professions, and the like. On perusing this correspondence, one finds that Fénélon did not scruple to use renegades to assist him in his enterprise:

"The arrival of M. Forant has been a cause of rejoicing to the inhabitants of La Tremblade. I trust he will be of much use in keeping them here, provided he does not exercise rigorous authority, which would render him odious. His birth, his relationship to several of them, and the religion which has been common to him with all those people, would

[1] Madame de Sévigné might have said, "to please the king," words which several persons added after their names in their act of abjuration.

make him hated more than any other, were he to use haughtiness and severity in order to reduce them to their duty. Still, the rude and intractable nature of these people demands a rigorous and ever vigilant authority. They must not be hurt, but they must be made to feel a hand always raised to hurt them if they resist."

Our next extract reveals a cold-blooded cruelty, worthy of a priest of Rome. An unfortunate pastor, ill, supposed to be dying, and thus unable to leave the country, had to choose between abjuration and the galleys or the scaffold. His faith gave way; what a prize for our missionary!

"We are making good use here at La Tremblade of the minister who had the full confidence of the people, and who has been converted. We bring him to our public conferences, where we make him repeat what he formerly used to say to animate the people against the Catholic Church. . . . . On the first occasion, the people, keeping behind him, said: 'Wicked man, why have you deceived us? why did you tell us that we ought to die for our religion, you who have abandoned us? Why do you not defend what you taught us?' He bore up under this humiliation; and I expect much fruit from it. . . . He had not left the kingdom, because he was dying, for several months; at last he got better. A public disputation was to have been held, but he abjured before the day appointed." . . "As soon," adds Fénélon, "as we discovered his *finesse*, we went to his house with several of the principal inhabitants who were the worst of our converts. . . . 'Gentlemen,' said we, 'judge what is to be thought of a religion whose ablest pastors prefer abjuring to defending it.' They shrugged their shoulders."

Fénélon's biographers have vaunted the success of his mission, but he does not seem to have been much satisfied with the results himself; and yet we must not forget that the Catholicism which he preached was of a very mitigated description. He begs for New Testaments, in order to distribute them in profusion; but they must be in large type.

"If we take away their books without giving them others, they will say that their ministers were quite right in telling them that we would not let them read the Bible, for fear they should see in it the condemnation of our superstition and idolatries." And again: "We thought it good at first to defer for some days the repetition of the *Ave Maria* in our sermons, and the other invocations of saints in the public prayers which we offered in the pulpit."

In spite of this, a short time before his return to Paris, after he had been nearly four months in Saintonge, he writes to Bossuet:

"Our converts are getting on a little better, but the progress is very slow; it is no small matter to change the feelings of a whole people. . . . The ill-converted Huguenots are attached to their religion even to the most horrible excess of obstinacy."

Then, to console himself for his failure, he begins to calumniate his victims, and to contradict himself:

"But as soon as the rigour of punishment appears, all their strength forsakes them. . . . If we wished to make them abjure Christianity and follow the Koran, we need only shew them the dragoons. Provided they assemble by night and resist all instruction, they think they have done enough. It is a formidable leaven in a nation."

Thus the ruined Huguenots (whose exit from the kingdom had been

barred more closely than ever by the advice of this missionary), assembling at night, at the peril of their lives, do so only out of a horrible excess of obstinacy, and are denounced by their calumniators as "cowardly against force, obstinate against the truth, and ready for all sorts of hypocrisy."

The nightly assemblies continuing, in spite of every effort on the part of the authorities, Louvois wrote (while Fénélon was still in Saintonge) to the Intendant Foucault to order "the dragoons to kill the greatest part of the Protestants whom they can lay hold on, without sparing the women, in order to intimidate them." Notwithstanding, assemblies never ceased to be held in Saintonge, till the promulgation of the edict of toleration in 1787. Several churches were even opened in 1761, but closed again in 1763 by orders from the court. They were finally reopened in 1774, not to be closed again, in spite of any commands.

C. DE FAYE.

*Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties, and Schools of Religious Thought.* Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A., F.S.A. Rivingtons. 1874.

Mr Blunt, whose "Annotated Book of Common Prayer" is well known in Church of England circles, has broken ground in the region of *Dogmengeschichte* before this, by a "Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology." The present work is, we presume, related to that one as the vagaries of heresy are to the growth of orthodox dogma. It embraces, under an alphabetical arrangement, some account not only of heretics, properly so called, but of all the eccentric forms of Christian belief which appeared in the mediæval church, or which still survive in Christendom, and even of Jewish and Heathen religions, and of Sceptics, who are of no religion. The reading which should qualify one man to do such a work well, would be encyclopædic, and Mr Blount professes to be only the editor; but we regret that he has not followed the example of similar dictionaries of composite authorship, at home and abroad, by indicating who are his collaborateurs. This is the more to be regretted because Mr Blunt himself belongs, in a pronounced way, to the (so-called) "Catholic" party within the Establishment; so that one would like to know how far his assistants represent the same side of Christian thought, or have been selected freely from scholars of all sides. Certainly no work of this description, which so imperatively calls not only for ample and accurate knowledge, but equally for the largest and most truly *Catholic* sympathies, will carry the weight of an authority if it bear the impress of any single school.

We can best test both its correctness and its fairness by those articles which deal with ourselves. Like every one else, except the Church of England, Presbyterians are a "sect," *passim*. We are told that "the Presbyterian Church in England" numbers "now" (1874) about seventy congregations. The number a year ago was precisely one hundred and thirty-eight. "There are also about the same number of congregations belonging to the United Presbyterians;" there really are

a little over one hundred. His information from America is not much better. He knows nothing of the union of the New and Old Schools into one great church. His latest news, on the authority of an anonymous "recent writer," is to the effect that "the American Presbyterians are adopting a liturgy, one being named, which is entitled, 'The Church Book for St Peter's, Rochester.'" We commend this intelligence to our American brethren. The good taste of this writer is on a par with his information. Speaking of the presbytery's superintendence of the doctrine preached by its ministers, he describes it as a "close espionage." It is to be hoped he does not understand what that word implies. Our readers will be no less surprised to learn that the Puritans of the reign of Edward VI. "wished to supplant, or, as they said, to complete, the English Reformation." The authority chiefly cited on early Puritanism is Bancroft. Nor are the representations given always consistent with each other. Under the heading, "Presbyterians," we read:—"There is no trace, however, of any large numbers of Presbyterian congregations existing before the Civil War." But under "Puritans," we are told of the convocation of sixty Puritan clergymen from the Eastern Counties in 1582, of the party boasting in 1585 to be 100,000 strong, and even of a whole county (Northampton) divided into *Classes* as early as 1557. These facts are true enough; but they are adduced, in face of the former representation, for the purpose of deepening the horror with which the reader is expected to hear of "a very wide-spread organisation," which was simply a "matricidal conspiracy against the Church of England"!

The qualifications of the compilers of this volume to be historians of "sects," receive further illustration from the article on the "Scottish Kirk." It is defined to be "a Presbyterian community founded on the ruins of the ancient Scottish Church." Patrick Hamilton was a "troublesome youth," who, "in addition to all his other transgressions, set himself up as a teacher of novelties to men old enough to be his grandfathers." Knox is handled in the same spirit; and the whole Reformation movement in Scotland is described as "to a far greater extent than in England, a political movement." In fact, the only "church" in Scotland known to Mr Blunt and his *confreres*, is the "Episcopal Church." There is in this large volume such a mass of varied information with such evidences of patient labour, that it is sad to see it disfigured both by careless errors and by the serious blemish of being written from the narrow stand-point of a "sect," which arrogates to itself the title of "the Church."

ED.

### HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.

*Die Iro-Schottische Missionskirche des Sechsten, Siebenten, und Achtan Jahrhunderts, und ihre Verbreitung und Bedentung auf dem Festland.* Von Dr J. H. A. EBRARD. 1873. [*The Iro-Scottish Mission Church of the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Centuries, and its Extension and Importance on the Continent.*]

We cannot better introduce this important work to the notice of our readers, than by quoting the following paragraph from the author's own preface:

"It is now ten years since I sent to Niedner's "Journal for Historical Theology," a series of papers on "The Culdean Church of the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Centuries." On that occasion (1862), after examining the first part of my manuscript, Dr Niedner wrote to me in the following terms:—'You have contributed to this journal and me, or rather to science, so important a gift in these papers, that even if you had not asked for an acknowledgment of them, I would have written to express to you my great joy at receiving them. Your "Culdees" are one of the most welcome and hitherto most desiderated enrichments of historical science.' And again, in July 1863, he wrote in these terms:—'I limit myself to a few lines to express to you my deeply-felt thanks for the continuation of your Culdee papers, by which you have at once so highly enriched and honoured this journal. Even if you have sometimes gone too far in extolling the Culdees, and pulling down Boniface and all the Romelings—on which point I do not pretend as yet to be able to give a thoroughly-considered opinion—there are two things of which I am already quite sure, that you have been the first to set in a clear light the pre-Romish and anti-Romish character and position of that great institution, and that by dint of your original researches, and your powerful faculty of combination, you have reached results which, in everything of importance, are completely legitimate and valid." And yet the materials upon which I have worked were limited in amount. With the exception of the earlier writings of Jamieson and Chalmers, it was only sources in the Latin tongue which, in the main, were at my command. What joy, then, was it to me when, two years after the appearance of my last paper, Dr M'Lauchlan published and sent me a copy of his masterly work of research, 'The Early Scottish Church' (1865), and opened up in it the old Irish and old Gaelic manuscript sources still preserved in Scotland and Ireland! And what still greater joy, when I found that his researches, which were quite independent of my own, confirmed in the most striking manner the results which I had previously reached! About the same date I became acquainted with a new series of interesting documents, in Dr Todds' 'Book of Hymns of the Ancient Church of Ireland' (1855), and I found in Thomas Stephen's 'History of Welsh Literature,' proofs of the astonishing extent to which the evangelical spirit of primitive Christianity had continued to live and work in the Culdean Church, in conscious opposition to the spirit and doctrine of Rome, even as late as the thirteenth and fourteenth century. The time therefore seemed to me to have come to reconstruct these earlier papers into a complete work, by availing myself of these and other newly-acquired sources of evidence. As further investigation goes on, much will perhaps be put more correctly and more fully in point of details, but in the main the certainty of the results already reached will, I have no doubt, remain unshaken."

After an introduction, which sketches rapidly the earlier history of the Culdean Church in Ireland and Scotland, and its extension to England, Iceland, and Greenland, Dr Ebrard's work is divided into six sections. The first treats of the Culdean reckoning of Easter, and the controversies arising out of the question in England and France; the second is occupied with "The Religion and Theology of the Culdees"; the third with their Church constitution and Monastic system; the fourth discusses the question of the "Miracles" of the Culdees; the fifth treats of the wide extension of the Culdean Missions on the continent of Europe; and the sixth gives a very copious account of the destruction of the Culdean institutions in France and Germany, chiefly through the instrumentality

of Winifred or Boniface, as well as of their final though late extinction in Scotland, Wales, and Ireland.

The work puts forward no claim to have solved *all* the problems outstanding on this little cultivated historical field, or to have entirely dissipated the darkness which has long rested upon it. The author admits that the materials as yet accessible are exceedingly scattered, and still stand much in need of critical sifting; but much manuscript material, he suggests, may still be lying buried in British, French, German, and Italian libraries, and when the attention of learned investigators in all these countries is once directed to the subject, it may well be still possible, by their united labours, to bring to light many precious documents. For the present, the author's design is no more than to clear the subject of many traditional errors with which it is encumbered, by the aid of such materials as are already available, and to awaken scientific interest in behalf of that Church in the hope of future results.

It is much to be desired that a competent translation of a work of so much British interest should ere long be forthcoming; and there is no branch of the British Church from which such a labour may more fairly be expected than from the Presbyterian, to which, to say the least, the Culdean Church of those early centuries had more affinity and resemblance than to any other. There is now no lack of men in the Presbyterian ministry and profession who are at home in German language and literature; and it is hoped that this early notice of Professor Ebrard's important work may stimulate some one—and if he has special Celtic sympathies, so much the better—to undertake a translation of it without delay. P. L.

*The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell, D.D., LL.D., late Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, South Carolina.* Volumes III. and IV. Edited by JOHN B. ADGER, D.D., and JOHN L. GIRARDEN, D.D. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Philadelphia: Alfred Martin. 1873.

We are promised a fifth volume of biography. But the two volumes now before us complete the collected publication of Dr Thornwell's own works. The editors impressively remark that, as he was cut off in the prime of life, much of his best and ripest thought has remained unspoken to this world. Nevertheless, the four volumes of his collected works are a valuable gift to the world and the Church. The Southern Presbyterian Church of America can well afford to have them regarded as fairly indicating the gifts and attainments of her great divine. The third and fourth volumes reveal the characteristic excellencies which we pointed out in our notice of the first and second,—high intellectual power, great moral earnestness, strenuous orthodoxy, and a sober and masculine eloquence far from common in public religious teaching. And they have an additional peculiarity of value, as giving the Christian world the means of comprehending the state of mind and feeling in the United States, specially in the Southern States, relatively to a number of practical problems with which our American cousins have been called to deal

not as mere theologians theorising *in vacuo*, but as Christian statesmen, experimenting on a grand scale for one of the most powerful of the empires of Christendom. Some of the now republished articles were formally, others of them were really, manifestoes of the Southern Church. They were all prepared before the Southern Confederacy had succumbed to the overwhelming force of Northern Federalism. And they may justly be regarded as, to a large extent, representing theologically the mind and heart of a broken-hearted Christian nation, which has given great heroic names to the Christian world's history.

The third volume, entitled "Theological and Controversial," has two parts. The first part, headed "Rationalistic Controversy," consists of an elaborate discussion of the Schleiermacherian theory of religion, as advocated by Mr Morell. In the second part, headed "Papal Controversy," we have, first, a still more elaborate discussion, exhibiting great affluence of Patristic and other learning, of questions regarding the rule of faith connected with the Apocryphal books; and, second, a discussion of "The Validity of the Baptism of the Church of Rome." Dr Thornwell maintains the view, rejected by Reformation Churches in general, but formally accepted by the Old School Presbyterian Church of the United States in 1845, that Popish baptism is not valid. His article is valuable, partly as shewing what a very able man can say against the view commonly received among Reformation divines (that Romish baptism is valid, because the Romish communion is a real though corrupted branch of the Christian Church), and mainly because here there is given, what is wanting in volume II., a careful statement by Dr Thornwell of the fundamental Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. The fourth volume is entitled, "Ecclesiastical." It contains discussions, under various sub-titles, on "Church Officers," "Church Operations," "Church Discipline," "The Church and Slavery," "The Southern Presbyterian Church," and "The Church and Secular Societies," along with an Appendix of "Miscellanea," which includes statements by Dr Hodge and others, criticised by Dr Thornwell. Of the articles on "Church Officers," a sample is reprinted in this number of our *Review*. Under the head of "Church Operations," Dr Thornwell vigorously assails the American Church System of "Boards," specifically distinct from our British Presbyterian system of Assembly "Committees." The articles on "Church Discipline" will be read with interest by those who care about problems of Christian statesmanship in relation to testing circumstances. But the articles most vividly interesting to us in Britain are those under the heads of "The Church and Slavery," and "The Southern Presbyterian Church." For they enable us to comprehend what views of Christian truth and duty led such heroes as Robert Lee and Stonewall Jackson to devote their lives to civil war in defence of a political system bound up with slavery, and which have led the Southern Church to stand aloof from the Northern Church, even after that political system has definitively ceased to be.

In relation to slavery, Dr Thornwell's position is, that bond-service is intrinsically lawful, as appears from the fact that bond-service has had place in the political or social system of civilised nations in general,

and that, in especial, slave-holders were unchallenged members of the Church of God under the old dispensation and in the apostolic age. So far, we regard his position as unassailable. We believe that, so far, his position is coincident with that of Dr Hodge. But, even supposing that slave-holding is not intrinsically sinful, the question remains, Whether *the American* system of slavery did not involve sin, so clearly that a Christian Church, though not (perhaps) excommunicating all slave-holders, was bound to protest against that system? Did not the system, by disregarding the sanctity of the marriage bond and family relationship, violate moral law? Did it not, by deliberately preventing men from growing up to the fulness of manhood, involve a continuous outrage on humanity? Bond-service, as such, does not necessarily involve this inhumanity and ungodliness. But the American system of bond-service appeared to involve it; and Dr Thornwell, at best, does not fairly grapple with the question of the American system in the concrete, as distinguished from bond-service in the abstract.

In relation to "The Southern American Church," his statements are important historical monuments, which, we think, conclusively put the Northern Church in the wrong; aye and until she obliterate from her records the brand of "rebellion" upon those who joined the great secession. Secession *may* have been politically a crime; though the Northern States, with ever memorable magnanimity, did not, on account of this supposed crime, shed one drop of blood after they had got the upper hand. But it was worse than absurd for a Church to brand this supposed political crime as a scandalous sin. It is well known that the noble Robert Lee and others, in going into the "rebellion," at the bidding of their respective States, were impelled, not by any sinful lust, but by regard to truth and duty as apprehended by them. They acted on a theory of the constitution of the United States—the theory of Confederacy *versus* Federalism—which had been maintained by not a few excellent citizens ever since those States began to be. Although, therefore, the Northern States had found it necessary to deal with this action as a political crime, it would, we repeat, have been worse than absurd for a Christian Church to regard it and brand it as a scandalous sin. We regret to say that the magnanimity of the Northern nation finds illustration of contrast in the relative action of the Northern Church. Can our British churches, in close alliance with that noble Northern Church, not do something towards getting them to obliterate the brand which she has affixed on the Southern?

We do not assume that an incorporating union of the Northern and Southern churches is necessary, or even desirable. In an empire so great as that of the United States, it may be found that a federal union of independent churches, analogous to the federal union of the States, is best for working purposes. The capabilities of Presbyterianism, at once flexible and strong, may thus find in America a demonstration more splendid than has been furnished elsewhere in the history of the Christian world. But at present, as between North and South, there is not even a federal union of American presbyterians. We trust that through the mediation of British presbyterian churches, the noble American

churches shall come into "federal relations." And in order to this end, we regard as the foremost indispensable means an excision by the Northern Church of everything in her record which sets forth secession as equivalent to scandalous sin. The editors' work has been singularly well done

J. M.

### Practical and Devotional.

*Sermons by the late R. S. Candlish, D.D.; with a Biographical Preface.* Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black.

The preface to this volume gives a short but interesting outline of the life of Dr Candlish, which we welcome in the mean time; while we wait with some impatience for the fuller record, here promised, of a career which would have been remarkable under any circumstances, but which became specially so in connection with the spiritual and ecclesiastical revolution with which it was identified. This volume, however, brings the author before us mainly in his character as preacher and pastor. We write the latter word advisedly; for we hold it to be an error to draw a hard and fast line between these two functions,—restricting the one to the proclamation of the truth in public assembly, and the other to such offices of Christian love and care as are rendered to the several families and members of a flock. Much of the best and most effective pastoral work is done in the pulpit. In our judgment, among the most noticeable and admirable qualities of these sermons, are the keen insight, the rare skill, and the rich, loving sympathy with which the truth as it is in Jesus is applied to the wants, and sins, and sorrows of every class among his hearers. Dr Candlish's subtle and searching intellect, keen-edged, and nimble as a Damascus blade in the most dexterous hand must always have made him an able controversialist; but he would not have been, as he without doubt was, one of the best preachers of his time, had he not possessed also a glowing enthusiasm for the grand doctrines of the gospel, and a gracious sympathy with the souls of men. It would be out of keeping with the design of a notice like the present to attempt any analysis of Dr Candlish's mind, or a full estimate of his powers, with the view of assigning him his permanent place among the great preachers and great men who help to mould their contemporaries, and who leave their mark on the Church of Christ for generations. The proper opportunity for such a task will be presented when his work comes to be recorded, and his hidden life revealed, in the promised biography. Meanwhile, we have pleasure in drawing attention to the remarkable discourses of this memorial volume, which it would be superfluous, if not presumptuous, to commend; and which, even if disposed to do so, we should be withheld from criticising, both by respect for the revered and honoured author so recently gone from us, and by sympathy with all those who, when they read these words of life, which it was once their privilege and joy to hear at his living lips, will be forced to sigh "for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still.'

R. T.

*The Word of Life: Being Selections from the Work of a Ministry.* By CHARLES J. BROWN, D.D., Edinburgh. London: James Nisbet & Co.

The author of these sermons is well known in Edinburgh, where he has exercised his ministry for well nigh forty years. He is justly held in high estimation, not only in the church to which he belongs, but, we may say, in all the churches. To the pen of Dr Brown we are already indebted for two or three other publications, such as the "Divine Glory of Christ," and a small volume, entitled "The Ministry," containing several most judicious and useful addresses to students in divinity. And now, late in life, after serving his Master in the ministry for so long a period, he has been induced by friends to give to the public this selection of sermons, preached, from time to time, to his present congregation. There are twenty-three discourses in all, along with several communion addresses.

Those who are familiar with Dr Charles Brown as a preacher, will not be disappointed with the perusal of these sermons. They will not, indeed, feel similarly moved and stirred in reading the author's *printed* sermons, as they would in listening to his loving voice, and to his well-known, animated, loving, spirit-stirring strains and appeals. It is one thing to listen to a preacher addressing us from the pulpit, and quite another to read his words in print. This holds true of most preachers, but specially so in the case of the author of these sermons. And so conscious was he himself of the fact, that he informs us this circumstance long held him back from committing some of his sermons to the press.

Neither will those who know Dr Brown look for any attempt on his part to leave the "old paths," and present the reader with new or startling aspects of the truth. While the defects are trifling,—such as redundancies in style, pardonable in extempore preaching, but not in written and printed discourses,—there can be no doubt as to the sterling truth of the matter in these sermons. The topics selected are varied and interesting. The theology, as was to be expected, is that of the Puritan divines, though clothed in a much more attractive dress. The central truths of Scripture are here brought forth and handled with much of the author's spiritual warmth, and in an eminently pointed, practical, and experimental manner. In particular, these sermons abound with one well-known feature of Dr Brown's preaching. We allude to the happy art of quoting exceedingly appropriate passages for the purpose of making Scripture shed light on Scripture, and thereby bringing out the hidden beauty and power of God's own Word. Of course, this method may be carried to an extreme, and perhaps some may consider this has been done in the composition of these sermons. But we cannot help thinking that it were well if our students and junior ministers gave more heed to this feature in their preparations for the pulpit. In this and several other respects our author's example is worthy of imitation. We have no hesitation in cordially recommending this volume.

W. E.

*For the Work of the Ministry: A Manual of Homiletical and Pastoral Theology.* By WM. GARDEN BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D. Strahan. 1873.
*A System of Christian Rhetoric, for the Use of Preachers and other Speakers.* By GEO. WINFRED HERVEY, M.A. Houston & Sons. 1873.

The variety of English works on Homiletics makes one welcome, with a touch of surprise, the simultaneous appearance of these two volumes. They are, however, as unlike one another as two books which cover in part the same field can well be. The Scottish Professor would find scant favour in the eyes of the English writer—for he has avowedly published his class lectures, and these, too, covering so extensive a range, as to make his treatment of homiletics proper of necessity more superficial than Mr Hervey approves. Dr Blaikie has, in truth, given us a handy, readable "manual" to the whole of that wide, and in this country little traversed, department of applied theology which deals with all the functions of the ministerial office. It would be ungracious to complain that, in attempting so much, he has had to do his work somewhat cursorily The whole subject of worship, for example, is despatched in a single chapter of about twenty pages. But the value of his book is still farther narrowed by the fact, that he has avoided theory, sticks to minute practical rules, and views everything (as a Scottish Professor should) from a Presbyterian, and even a Scottish point of view. To be nothing if not "practical," is, indeed, the besetting sin of all English and American writers on the subject, and Dr Blaikie appears to be quite unacquainted with the Germans. Not a single German author figures in his Appendix on the literature of the subject. Yet in homiletics, especially, the only attempts to discover a trustworthy theory on which to found the practical art of Christian preaching, have been made in the works of Stier and Harms of Schweizer and Palmer. We could have wished from Professor Blaikie some exhibition of the interior relations of the Christian sermon to the Divine Word, to Cultus, and to the consciousness of the Church. In Scotland, especially, where the very perception of what Christian Cultus means has next to no existence, and where preaching has suffered seriously through its divorce from the life of the people, this would have had peculiar value. What Dr Blaikie has done, is to follow in the footsteps of writers like Moore, Alexander, Kidder, Broadus, and Shedd. Many of the old sayings, apt counsels, quotations, and even familiar anecdotes, reappear in his pages. In this line, it is ample justice to say that he has done well. His chapters are better arranged than those of most of his predecessors; his materials better handled; his style more elegant. He is never dull; while his suggestions are exceedingly sensible and well-considered. The chapters which bear upon such pastoral work as visitation, organization, and the numerous details of modern ministerial activity, will be found specially fresh and helpful to young ministers, coming, as they do, from a pastor of such tried and successful experience as Dr Blaikie.

Mr Hervey's is a more ambitious work. He "endeavoured," he tells us, "to find the true ground-work of homiletics, and to reduce the

science to something like a clear and sufficient system." He treats the eloquence of the pulpit as a peculiar variety of rhetoric; and the two chief points in which he finds its peculiarity to rest are these:—(1.) That the true models for the rhetoric of the preacher are the public addresses of the Hebrew prophets, the sermons of our Lord, and the sacred speeches of Peter, Stephen, and Paul. Hence he devotes a deal of attention to deduce from such Scripture examples the rules to be observed under each head of rhetoric, such as invention and style. (2.) His other principle is, that the preacher is really, in a sense, a prophet too, and has promised to him a special assistance of the Holy Spirit, which our author terms "partial, or homiletical inspiration." Though we have named this last, Mr Harvey puts it foremost, and devotes to it his first book, which is, we think, the freshest and most valuable portion of his work. There is nothing fanatical in his handling of this delicate subject, but a great deal that is most wise, and very well adapted to solemnise and profit every preacher. For the rest, we can only say that Mr Harvey's handling of the various matters which fall under the usual divisions of rhetoric is very simple, and, if a trifle tedious, yet full in every page with evidences of a very varied and copious reading.

ED.

*The Book of Common Prayer Revised.* London: Prayer Book Revision Society. EWINS & Co. 1874.

The Society for the Revision of the Prayer-book has for a good many years been pressing that subject on the public and the legislature with very little success. It is curious that it should only now have completed its own revised recension, embodying the changes it desire. One would have thought such a work should have been its earliest care; and that, if not issued before, it would hardly have been deemed worth while now when the chance of legislative interference to reform the Church of England is less than ever. Yet here it is at last; with of course little change in the order of daily service, but all the old phrases, under which Laudism and Ritualism have found shelter, carefully expunged in a way that would have delighted the heart of a Puritan of the reign of James. The one fatal defect is that it comes too late; too late for success; too late even for justice, since the objectionable clauses can plead equally with the innocent ones the prestige of law and usage for three centuries; too late, certainly, for the consistency of the amiable revisionists. Their changes are substantially, often verbally, the same with those made by the Free Church of England, whose revised Book of Common Prayer (London: Johnson, Fleet Street, N.D.) is in use throughout its congregations. The difference is, that the Free Church of England has taken up a position where it can use its revised prayer-book; whereas evangelical churchmen of the Revision Society cling to a position where they are doomed to use a Prayer-book they object to, with no reasonable hope of ever being allowed to change one word of it. ED.

MISCELLANEOUS.

*In the Holy Land.* By the Rev. ANDREW THOMSON, D.D. London: Nelson & Sons. 1874.

It must be confessed that one takes up a book of this sort with some misgiving. The "Holy Land" has suffered a good deal from tourists, who rushed into print after having (in Dr Thomson's words) "skimmed the surface of the land like summer swallows;" and readers who are, with a touch of impatience, awaiting the slow but reliable results of the "Exploration Fund," are apt to care for nothing less full or scientific. Now, the book before us professes to be nothing more than notes of a "short clerical furlough," and it is no more; but it is good of its kind. Dr Thomson has a quick, shrewd eye, a facile pen, and a reverent spirit, well-stored with Scripture. He made good use of his time. He travelled in good company: Professor Milligan of Aberdeen, and the late Emanuel Deutsch (whose literary remains have just appeared in a collected form) were of his party. In fact, one of these chapters records a rain-storm at Sychar, which, by sowing the seeds of disease, probably hastened, if it did not cause, the early loss of that lamented scholar. What the party did, and what they saw, are told in a fluent, pleasant style, well suited to the periodicals in which the substance of the volume first appeared; and if they neither did nor saw anything very remarkable, still there is a freshness about Palestine, as seen by watchful eyes and described in honest words, which is always attractive.

Impressed with the fact, which is worth noting, that Oriental customs are being changed so rapidly, that "we have need to make haste if we would catch the old picture of the East entire," Dr Thomson paid special heed to illustrations of Scripture in actual life, and he was happy in finding them. Thus, *e.g.*, on the Bethany road he met a man riding on an ass' colt, "the mother ass coming up immediately behind him;" near Siloam, he had stones flung at him by a maniac among the tombs; and the difficulty about the fig-tree which Jesus blasted, he thinks solved itself, also on the road to Bethany, by a tree which he found during Passion week, "several weeks in advance of all the others,—all green with foliage, and with ripe fruit underneath it" [*i. e.* underneath its leaves]. "The fruit," he adds, "was still sweet, even to the smell, when we opened our package two months afterwards." In explanation of Mary's apparent negligence in Luke ii. 44, he tells us, as a fact, that on the first day of a journey travellers do not start "till within a few hours of sunset," and gives as the reason for this "very ancient custom," that, "if on the first evening of unloading the baggage, it was found that anything of value had been left behind, or anything indispensable to the journey unprovided, there might yet be time to return and procure it." In spite of Dr Thomson's "uniform experience," this is certainly not an invariable rule; one would like to know if the practice is really general. Speaking of this passage in Luke reminds us that Dr Thomson

found the original of Holman Hunt's chief figure in his "Finding in the Temple," in the person of "a youth of twelve years of age, the most beautiful lad we ever looked upon," who is a grandson of the Samaritan High Priest. This is curious, when one recalls the claims of the Samaritans to a partially Hebrew lineage. Our traveller ventures the mournful prediction, that another century will probably see the whole Samaritan Church in its sepulchre. In that event, this beautiful lad who sat for the youthful Christ of Mr Hunt, may chance to prove the last of the High Priests on Gerizim.

Dr Thomson is usually cautious and well-informed on the subject of "holy places." But while he rejects the traditional "Holy Sepulchre," on what seem to us barely conclusive grounds, he accepts the traditional Gethsemane on grounds still less conclusive. He admits that the original garden (olive-farm, rather) must have been much larger. But, in any case, the present enclosed site must always have been a mere corner or tongue thrust forward betwixt bounding footpaths,—surely an unlikely retreat for one in search of solitude, shadow, and quiet. The site of Sodom, too, he still places to the south-east of the Dead Sea, without noticing the recent researches of Canon Tristram, who has, with extreme probability, identified Zoar with a ruin on its north-eastern shore, which would place the perished cities in the Ghor. Opinion seems to be settling down in favour of Tell Hum as the Capernaum of the Gospels; and Dr Thomson has advanced additional evidence to that urged by Captain Wilson in favour of Khan Minyeh being the western Bethsaida, from the peculiar adaptation of its little bay for the protection of fishing-boats, and from the abundance of fish at this particular spot. On the difficult question of the Mount of Beatitudes, our author pronounces in favour of Hattin; but he has surely made a strange slip in citing the words, "a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without your Father," as if they occurred in the Sermon on the Mount. We are sorry to learn that Jacob's well has been "clogged up with great stones, which had evidently been hurled in by the united strength of many men, and had stopped each other's progress a long way from the bottom." It is sad to find one of the most unquestioned of the sacred spots turned into "an absolute ruin" by the wilful violence of fanatical Moslems. With a just instinct for the unchanged features of the Bible land, Dr Thomson dwells fondly on the ancient wells at Nazareth and Cana; he has omitted the one at Bethany, which stands close by the main road, and, though little noticed by travellers, bears traces of great antiquity. When the book reaches its second edition—as we hope it soon will—the anachronism on p. 79, which speaks of Saladin as having flourished "in the sixteenth century," should be corrected. Perhaps, also, perfect taste might lead to the omission of certain repeated references to Monsignor Capel and his "most brilliant prize," the Scottish Marquis, whom the author found kneeling before a temporary altar on the banks of the Jordan. These are but slight blemishes; and on the whole we welcome Dr Thomson's book as a thoroughly sound, honest piece of work, full of good descriptive writing, and of close observation of all that a passing tourist could be expected to observe. ED.

*Literary Remains of the late Emanuel Deutsch; with a brief Memoir.* London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1874.

A feeling of deep regret was excited last spring when tidings reached England of the death of the eminent Jewish scholar whose article on the Talmud in the *Quarterly Review* had a few years ago created so profound an impression upon the public mind. A perusal of the volume just published will deepen this feeling of regret. The "Remains" are too fragmentary to be satisfactory, but they shew that Mr Deutsch possessed almost unrivalled qualifications for the task to which he had addressed himself. Learned, as few men in Europe were, in a lore which is generally supposed to make those who devote themselves to it dull and pedantic, he wrote on his Semitic subjects with a poetical grace and a passionate enthusiasm which delighted the general public. The human interest to him always preponderated over the learned, and the result was, that he was eagerly listened to by those who would have listened to no other writer on such subjects. In addition to his famous Talmud article, we have in the present volume several lectures reprinted which he delivered in various towns in England. In these lectures the writer's aim is the same as in the article, to shew that there are life and poetry, deep thoughts and pleasant fancies, hidden in the ponderous tomes of the Jewish "Hansard," from which even professed scholars so often turn away in despair.

"Between the rugged boulders of the law," he writes, "which bestrew the pass of the Talmud, there grow the blue flowers of romance and poetry, in the most Catholic and Eastern sense. Parable, tale, gnome, saga,—its elements are taken from heaven and earth; but chiefly and most lovingly from the human heart and from Scripture; for every verse and every word in this latter became, as it were, a golden nail upon which it hung its gorgeous tapestries."

Besides the articles on the Talmud, Islam, the Targums, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and other similar themes, the volume contains some charmingly written papers upon other subjects. There are "Five Letters on the Œcumenical Council," which appeared originally in *The Times;* a review of M. Renan's second work, *Les Apôtres;* and a paper which appeared in the *Saturday Review*, on "Hermes Trismegistus." To this last we would specially call attention, as an example of the power of the writer to throw the charm of life and reality even around subjects farthest removed from modern sympathies. Not the least interesting part of the book is the brief *Memoir*, in which the story of a scholar's life is simply and gracefully told by an anonymous friend. From it we learn that he was a native of Prussian Silesia, and at the age of eight was placed under the care of his uncle, a learned Rabbi, who appears to have been almost as exacting a taskmaster, though a kinder one, than the father of Mr John Stuart Mill. At sixteen he found his way to Berlin, where he studied Hebrew and Greek, history and criticism, under eminent professors of the university. Mr Deutsch himself thus described his life in Berlin:

"While Hengstenberg insisted with stentorian voice on every word of

Scripture being verbally inspired, and the Hyksos being the sons of Jacob, Vatke, next door to him, represented the furthest steps of the non-Mosaic origin and authorship even of the Ten Commandments. Then, leaving these theological arenas, I found myself at the feet of Boeckh, who, with attic grace, opened up the arena of classic Hellas, making the *cistæ mysticæ* become clear revelations. Under his guidance I saw that favoured branch of mankind at their play, in their earnestness, in the house and the market-place, in war and peace; their slaves, their women and children, their seers and priests, their poets and poetesses; and this while Meimeke taught me Horace by the light of Herman and Heine. And to open my eyes for the greater future of human strivings, how out of barbarism grew the light and glory of the Renaissance, and thence to the presence of our own day,—and to shew the bright germs of those goodly trees of freedom under whose shadows the people of Europe now dwell,—was there not Ranke? while Ritter took us 'from Greenland's icy mountains to Sah'ra's burning sands,' and spoke of all plants, from the cedars of Lebanon to the hyssop that grows in the ruins of Vizagapatam. To enable me better to understand the British Museum, the treatises on the Mine and Thine, and the Gate of the Trover, was there not Stahl, the brilliant and erudite German Disraeli, who defended throne and state, and a faith not that of his fathers, and interpreted to us the Pandects and the Institutes?"

Like many other learned Germans, young Deutsch found his way from Berlin to London, and joined the British Museum in 1855. In that service he remained until his death. The history of the closing scenes is very melancholy. He was most unwilling to leave the studies which he loved,—especially to abandon the hopes of completing his *magnum opus* on the Talmud, which was the work of his life. Witness these sad words:

"I cannot," he wrote, "take comfort in the thought of death,—I want to live. There is so much life, hot full life, within, that it shrinks from darkness and deadness. I envy those who can fly on the mind's wings to this harbour of refuge; I cannot follow, but keep tossing outside in my broken craft, through foam, and rock, and mist." J. G.

*The Principles of the Westminster Standards Persecuting.* By WILLIAM MARSHALL, D.D., Coupar-Angus. Edinburgh. 1873.

This book is too much like the speech of a public prosecutor to be pleasant reading. The author argues his case with great clearness and force, but he shews no tenderness towards the venerable criminal. To do Dr Marshall justice, he admits that his book is simply an ecclesiastical pamphlet, which has somehow grown into a goodly volume; and this, taken in connection with the fact that it had its origin in an ecclesiastical conflict of singular acrimony, may explain, if not altogether justify, some rather sharp personalities which are no ornament to its pages. A more important point than the taste of the book, however, is the amount of truth to be conceded to the views which Dr Marshall advocates. Do the Westminster Standards really teach persecuting principles in religion? It is difficult to resist the evidence adduced by Dr Marshall, which seems to shew that their compilers were prepared to deal with heretics and infidels, and that through the action of the State, in a manner which falls

little, if at all, short of persecution. At the same time it must not be forgotten, that in those days Government possessed by common consent rights and duties with regard to religion which it does not possess now. Although, however, we are not prepared to defend the statements of the authors of the Confession, still less are we prepared to endorse those of Dr Marshall. According to him a man is persecuted when he suffers on account of religion, no matter of what character his religion be, or whether he has any religion at all. To exclude a man from a civil post because of his religion, is, according to Dr Marshall, clearly persecution. But what does such a principle lead to? The Christian statesman who has to select a teacher (say) of philosophy in a university, and who prefers an otherwise less qualified candidate over one more highly qualified who openly advocates infidel opinions, is, according to these views, neither more nor less than a persecutor. The voter who refuses his vote to an otherwise highly competent Parliamentary candidate, because he is an atheist, is no less a persecutor. If we accept these principles, we seem shut up to this conclusion (which was that of Tertullian, and which is adopted, we understand, by some small sects at the present day), that political life and action are inadmissible to a Christian man. If, in making his decisions, he may not be influenced as a motive by that which is nearest his heart, we certainly do not see how a Christian can accept the function of Government, whether in the superior office of statesman or the inferior office of voter. In all decisions regarding a choice of men for the work of teaching or governing his country, he must be allowed to give due weight to their views regarding religion. It does not follow from this that he will in all cases decide against the irreligious men, for he may often feel that by forbearance and concession to such men he may be acting more in the spirit of Christ than by opposing them, but he must reserve to himself the right, whether as statesman or as citizen, of refusing to such men a post which is wholly or in part in his gift, on religious grounds, without incurring the odious charge of persecution.

J. G.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Perhaps the place of honour this quarter belongs not to any new book, but to a reprint. Yet we should have attached still more importance to the Messrs Clark's recent issue of Calvin's *Institutio Christianæ Religionis* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1874), had it been really a new edition, and not a simple reprint of Tholuck's edition, familiar for years to divines. Though these volumes bear the imprint of an Edinburgh house, and wear the shapely aspect we have learned to associate with Messrs Clark's theological publications, the sheets have been printed in Germany, and profess to be no more than a simple re-issue, without a note or even word of preface, of the most accurate edition of Calvin's great work hitherto executed by any scholar. Still we are thankful to welcome this reappearance of the master of Reformation theology in a shape so accessible to students and

so handy for use. Dr Dods' "Augustine Series" of translations goes steadily forward. The latest instalment, forming the first issue for the third year of publication, is before us, and we desire again to renew our very cordial recommendation of this important publication. One of the volumes on our table contains (without any preface) the first part of Augustine's *Tractates on St John's Gospel* (Clark, 1873). The translator, Rev. John Gibb, has studied faithfulness, which indeed, more than idiomatic elegance, seems to characterise most of this series. And rightly; for Augustine's sentences are often hard to reproduce in their compressed or involved sense, and the English which strives to reflect his thoughts with exactness will sometimes be of necessity a little cramped. But the work done here is very honest careful work, and the same may be said for the whole of the other volume before us, which is from two different translators. It contains minor pieces. Professor Shaw of Derry has rendered the *Enchiridion* and the *De Doctrinâ Christianâ* with admirable clearness and point. Mr Salmond of Barry has also enriched his scholarly versions both of the manual *On Catechising* and of the short and early treatise on the *Symbolum Apostolicum*, written when the Father was only a presbyter (entitled, *Faith and the Creed*), by throwing into footnotes important variations in the text.

In our last number we reviewed at length the leading positions of Ewald's great work, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel, apropos* of the appearance of the work in an English version. Since then we have received the fifth volume (*History of Israel*, vol. V., Longmans, 1874) of the English edition (which corresponds to the *fourth* of the original German), translated by Mr Estlin Carpenter, M.A. This volume covers what the author has termed the "Hagiocracy," or the period stretching from the fall of Jerusalem under the Chaldeans, to the complete subjugation of the nation by the Romans, that is, virtually, till the advent of Messiah. A concluding volume, on the time of our Lord, not yet translated, will complete this *opus magnum*. Students of the Old Testament who do not read German, will find the version of Mr Carpenter to read like an original composition, it is so fresh and living. The contents of this volume, too, embracing as it does a period (succeeding the close of the canon) less known and moulded by more varied influences than the earlier stages of Hebrew history, will have interest for many who would take just offence at Ewald's rash and often audacious handling of his authorities, where the only authorities available are the inspired books of Holy Scripture.

We have on our table this quarter an unusual number of publications designed to aid in private or domestic devotion. Dr Maxwell Nicholson, of St Stephen's, Edinburgh, has prepared *Family Prayers* (Oliver & Boyd, 1874) for a month, with thanksgivings, &c., for special occasions; and Dr Oxenden, Bishop of Montreal (whose numerous evangelical volumes for plain readers are well known), has issued, in conjunction with Rev. C. H. Ramsden, a "second series" of his *Family Prayers* (Hatchards, 1874). These also cover the mornings and evenings of a month. In both these volumes the prayers are simple, of moderate length, in bold type, and full of sound devotional matter. The Scotch one is, we think,

to be preferred for its greater completeness as well as variety, only here and there the sentences are rather long. The defect of both books is the absence of such a rich, chastened, and solemn style, laden with the Christian experience of generations, as can only be caught through long familiarity with the best of the ancient liturgies. *The Gates of Prayer* (Nisbet, 1874) is a book of daily *private* prayers, also for a month, by Dr Macduff, who has already done so much (in his *Night and Morning Watches*, and otherwise) to foster the spirit of worship. We can recommend it to those who find it difficult to use to profit the few precious minutes that have usually to be snatched from pressing engagements for personal communion with God. Under a fantastic title, *Apples of Gold by Starlight* (Williams & Norgate), which we do not profess to understand, Miss Stapleton has given us a brief text of Scripture, with an original verse of poetry, for every day in the year. Church of England readers will find much illustration of their Church service in a handy form in *The Prayer Book, with Scripture Proofs and Historical Notes*, by Theod. Wirgman, M.A. (Bemrose & Sons), though it professes to be no more than an abridgment of Bailey's "Liturgy compared with the Bible," and an introduction to that and other full treatises on the subject. We cannot say much for the author's logic. He thinks he can prove that the "primitive liturgy must have had direct apostolic sanction," because otherwise it is impossible to explain the agreement of all ancient offices in their main points. This exaggeration of a bare probability into a demonstration is not very creditable.

Of new expository books for the people, we can only acknowledge the second (concluding) volume of Bishop Oxenden's *Simple Exposition of the Psalms* (Hatchard, 1874),—these are very slight notes indeed; and *Nehemiah the Tirshatha* (Nisbet, 1874), by the Rev. J. M. Randall, a blind clergyman in Norfolk, who has dictated those sermons on what he justly calls a "rather neglected" book of Scripture, after preaching them to his village flock: a good specimen of pulpit lectures, plain, interesting, and profitable.

Professor Witherow, of Magee College, has laid the Protestants of the North of Ireland under obligation by his careful and interesting history, *Derry and Enniskillen in* 1689 (Belfast, Mullan, 1873). From the original accounts of Walker, Mackenzie, Hamilton, M'Carmick, and others, Mr Witherow has told over again with much fulness of detail the famous story how Irish Protestantism kept the walls of Derry, and fought the fight of Enniskillen—the story which glows on the vivid page of Macaulay. It is most desirable that the old animosity of creed and race should die out of the men of Ulster, instead of being annually inflamed into riot by faction-celebrations; but it is not desirable at all that the men of Ulster should ever forget what they and the liberties of England owe to the hardihood and strenuous endurance of their forefathers. We cannot too highly praise the admirably fair and Christian temper in which Professor Witherow has handled this rather delicate subject, or the lessons he draws from it. Warm as he is in his admiration for the Presbyterians of 1689, and thankful for the issue of the strife, he closes with a manly expostulation to his co-religionists not "to celebrate the

victories of their ancestors in any form that is calculated to excite the prejudices and provoke the ill-will" of their neighbours. "No truly brave man," he says, "ever insults the vanquished by reminding him and his, years afterwards, of the defeat." May these wise words be weighed by the Orangemen of Ulster!

We give a very cordial welcome to a memorial volume which many will enjoy: *Select Remains of Islay Burns, D.D.* (Nisbet, 1874). The "Remains" consist of a dozen sermons, and nearly as many other lectures and essays, selected from his papers by his cousin, the Rev. J. C. Burns, of Kirkliston. Professor Blaikie has prefixed a genial and appreciative "Memoir," not too long, yet not at all sketchy, which originally appeared (in a briefer form) in the *Sunday Magazine*. The part of the volume which will draw most readers will probably be the specimens of Professor Burns' Apologetic Lectures. They shew a capable and cultured man, full of the Christian spirit, and specially able to state the power of his faith to meet the deeper indestructible needs of human nature. The selection closes with an article which appeared originally in our own pages.

We must await the appearance of the second volume before we are able to speak fully of the late Dr Guthrie's *Autobiography and Memoir* (Isbister & Co., 1874); but we may here say a word on that unfinished autobiography of which we now possess the sole fragment we shall ever have. It is to this part of the volume all its readers have eagerly turned, and we fear the result in many instances has been rather disappointing. It is readable, of course, and the picture of provincial life in Scotland early in the century has touches of real value; but it fails completely to put before us any aspect of Thomas Guthrie, except the most *outward* one; and it is, besides, so full of blemishes, which a second revision would have pruned away, that one almost regrets, for its author's fame, that such a defective *torso* was suffered to appear. It says much for his two sons who are at work on the "Life," that they have been able in the remainder of the volume to go over the same ground without producing any sense of iteration. We look forward with interest to the completion of their filial task.

*Faith-Work* (Isbister, 1874) is the title of a small volume in which the Rev. W. E. Boardman has told the story of the labours of Dr Cullis, a Boston physician, who was led by the death of his wife to devote himself for Christ's sake to found and maintain a Home in that city for consumptive patients, as well as other charities. His is a sort of repetition of Mr Müller of Bristol's experience, and the record is very interesting. The Religious Tract Society send us a short record by Major-General Lake, C.S.I., of the faithful work done in India during a long term of service by the late lamented *Sir Donald M'Leod, C.B., K.C.S.I.* Much of it is a reprint from the *Sunday at Home*. It deserved to be illustrated with a better portrait of the distinguished governor of the Punjab. From the same Society we have also received a useful, though unpretending little book, very fit to be put at this time into the hands of young men who are honest doubters, not confirmed sceptics: *Cautions for Doubters*, by the Rev. J. H. Titcomb, M.A. To minds shaken by the

plausible and confident objections so freely urged against Scripture and even against a personal Deity, Mr Titcomb presents not so much counter arguments as considerations which may make the reverent and cautious pause before they commit themselves to an unbelief which is to the full as dogmatic as the belief which it opposes. Naturally, there is a copious use made of the argument from analogy. The tone is candid and the style quite perspicuous. *The Old Book Tested*, by the Rev. John White (Hodder & Stoughton), is a book of the same class, but of far less value. It consists of popular lectures delivered by its author, who is a congregationalist minister in Belfast.

What Mr Gilfillan, of Dundee, calls his "prose poem" in honour of the *Bards of the Bible*, has just reached its sixth edition (London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co., 1874); and a poem which might about as well be in prose has reached us, not only in a new, but in a highly elegant edition, with gilt edges and red lines round every page, we mean Mr Bickersteth's *Yesterday, To-day, and for Ever* (Rivingtons, 1873). There must be people who succeed in perusing this formidable epic in twelve books, to which Pollock himself is light reading, but we have not found it practicable. *Religious Poems*, by the author of "Stepping Heavenward" (Nisbet & Co.), are full of piety and contain a few hymns of value, but the collection is too large and indiscriminate.

Mrs Bayley, the authoress of "Ragged Homes," is convinced that "the mothers alone will not mend such homes," and therefore proposes working-men's classes for the study of the Bible. In *Long Evenings and Work to do in Them* (Nisbet, 1874), will be found some specimens of instruction for such classes. We wish the earnest authoress success in her efforts to enlist ladies in work which seems quite suitable to them. We have seldom seen a better book of sermons for the little folk than the Rev. Mr Wilson of the Barclay Church, Edinburgh, has given us in *The Gospel and its Fruits* (Nisbet, 1874). It contains a series of complete services, hymns and prayers included; and parents who will use it for the church in their house will thank us for recommending it. A third series of *Sermons* by the late Rev. E. L. Hull, B.A., suggests how the two former series have been appreciated. They are far above the common run of similar productions.

# PRESBYTERIAN UNITY: AN ADDRESS FROM AMERICA.*

*To the Churches of Christ, organised on Presbyterian principles, throughout the world.*

CHURCHES of the Presbyterian family are found, though under a variety of names, in Europe, in America, in Australia, and in the mission fields of Asia and Africa. If these could be regarded as one communion, they would constitute, perhaps, the largest Protestant Church in the world. But, at present, they are united by no visible bond, either of fellowship or of work. Of late, however, it has occurred simultaneously to a number of minds in different countries, that those who hold to the Presbyterian form of Church government may, in perfect consistency with their well-known and general interest in all the branches of the Church Universal, inquire for some way of coming into formal communion with each other, and of promoting great causes by joint action.

It is not proposed to form an organic union of all the Presbyterian Churches throughout the world. It is evident that one General Assembly could not regulate, with advantage, the internal economy of Churches in such widely separated countries as Switzerland, Germany, France, England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Australia, the United States, and Canada. Great injury might arise from any attempt to interfere with these different Churches in the management of their own affairs; for all ecclesiastical history shews that serious dangers are to be apprehended from the establishment of any central power, which would be almost sure to interfere with the liberty of local Churches and of individuals. Some denominations, moreover, have grand historical recollections which they wish to cherish; and some regard it as their duty to bear a testimony in behalf of truths which others seem to them to overlook. In these circumstances, the Churches will not be asked to merge their separate existence in one large

* Just as we go to press, we have received this important document from Principal M'Cosh, and gladly give it a place in our pages.—Ed. *B. and F. E. Review.*

organisation, but, retaining their self-government, to meet with the other members of the Presbyterian family to consult for the good of the Church at large and for the glory of God.

In order that a Church be entitled to join this union, it should hold to the Presbyterian form of government, and have a creed in accordance with the *Consensus* of the Reformed Churches. No new creed or formulary of any kind is contemplated.

Several formal steps have been taken with the view of effecting this Presbyterian union. The subject was specially brought before the great meeting held in Philadelphia in 1872, to celebrate the Tercentenary of the Scottish Reformation. The General Assembly of 1873 of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America unanimously adopted resolutions in favour of an Œcumenical Council of Presbyterian Churches, and appointed a Committee to have its resolutions carried into effect. In the same year, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland passed a series of like resolutions; and it is ready to join with other Churches in seeking the same great end.

Having respect to this concurrent expression of feeling, the Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America availed themselves of the presence of so many Presbyterian ministers and elders at the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, in 1873, to hold a meeting for a comparison of views on this subject. The meeting was held on October 6th. About one hundred and fifty persons attended, coming from various Presbyterian denominations in widely distant countries; from the principal Presbyterian Churches in the United States and the Dominion of Canada; from England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland; from Italy and Germany.* The utmost cordiality was shewn at the meeting, and the following resolutions were adopted unanimously:

1. That whereas the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, at their last meetings, passed resolutions in favour of an Œcumenical Council of Presbyterian Churches, we, providentially brought together at this time, and belonging to various branches of the Presbyterian family, cordially sympathise with these movements toward a General Council of the Presbyterian Churches in various lands.

2. That the following gentlemen † be a Committee to correspond with individuals and with organised bodies in order to ascertain the feeling of

---

* The French-speaking deputies to the Alliance were otherwise engaged that evening, but a separate meeting was afterwards held with them, when they approved most heartily of the action that had been taken.

† The names of the Committee so appointed are signed to this address.

Presbyterians in regard to such Federal Council, and to take such measures as may in their judgment promote this object.

3. That this Committee be authorised to co-operate, as far as possible, with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and with the Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

The Committee thus appointed have a deep sense of the responsibility laid on them. While they believe that the cause is good, and that there is sufficient popular opinion in its behalf to secure, with the blessing of Almighty God, its ultimate success, they fear lest they should take any step that might injure so noble an undertaking. They therefore desire to begin and carry on all their measures under the guidance of the wisdom that is from above. All that they propose at present is to ask, as they now do, every Presbyterian organisation in the world:

FIRST, *To express in a formal manner its approval of the object; and,*

SECONDLY, *To appoint a Committee to meet or correspond with Committees from other Presbyterian Denominations, for the purpose of arranging for a meeting or convention of Representatives to be appointed by the Denominations, which meeting may effect an Organisation, and determine its character and practical modes of action.*

Meanwhile, they solicit attention to the following benefits which, by the grace of God, may be expected to flow from the proposed union:

1. It would exhibit before the world the substantial unity, quite consistent with minor diversities, of the one great family of Presbyterian Churches.

2. It would greatly tend to hold up and strengthen weak and struggling Churches, by shewing that they are members of a large body. The Protestant Churches of the Continent of Europe, for example, feel the great need of sympathy and support from Churches more favourably situated.

3. It would enable Churches, which are not inclined to organic union, to manifest their belief in the unity of the Church and to fraternise with those whom they love, while they still hold to their distinctive testimony.

4. Each Presbyterian Church would become acquainted with the constitution and work of sister Churches, and their interest in each other would be proportionally increased. Some might be led in this way to see in other Churches excellencies which they would choose to adopt.

5. The Churches may thus be led to combine in behalf of the truth, and against prevalent errors; as, for instance, to defend the

obligations of the Sabbath, to resist the insidious efforts of the Papacy, especially in the matter of education, and to withstand Infidelity in its various forms.

6. Without interfering with the free action of the Churches, this Council might distribute judiciously the evangelical work in the great field, "which is the world;" allocating a sphere to each, discouraging the planting of two congregations where one might serve, or the establishment of two missions at one place, while hundreds of other places have none. In this way the resources of the Church would be husbanded, and her energies concentrated on great enterprises.

7. It would demonstrate to the Christian world these great facts in the working of the Presbyterian system: That, by its reasonable polity, it consists with every form of civil government; that, by the simplicity of its usages, it is adapted to all the varying conditions of the Church upon the earth; and that, by its equal distance from license and arrogance, it is best prepared to recognise the kinship of all believers.

8. It would manifest the proportions and power of the Presbyterian Churches, and thus offer effectual resistance to the exclusive pretensions of Prelacy and Ritualism in all their forms.

9. From such a Council, hallowed and quickened by the Redeemer's presence, there might proceed, as from a heart, new impulses of spiritual life, bringing every member of the Church into closer fellowship with his Divine Master, into deeper affection for his brethren for his Master's sake, and into more entire consecration of all his powers to the Master's work.

HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor, New York University, N. Y.
J. W. DAWSON, Principal Macgill College, Montreal, Canada.
WM. PAXTON, D.D., New York, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.
H. D. GANSE, „ Reformed Church in America.
HOWELL POWELL, „ Welsh Presbyterian Church.
H. L. GRANDLIENARD, „ French Evangelical Church.
JOHN HALL, D.D., „ Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.
DAVID GREGG, „ Reformed Presbyterian Church.
WM. ORMISTON, D.D., „ Reformed Church in America.
J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., Lancaster, Pa., Reformed Church in the U. S.
JAMES MURRAY, D.D., Modr. Pres. Ch. of the Lower Provinces of B. N. A.
G. D. MATHEWS, New York, United Presbyterian Church, *Secretary.*
JAMES M'COSH, D.D., LL.D., President of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., *Chairman.*

*New York, 1874.*

# BRITISH AND FOREIGN

# EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

## JULY 1874.

### ART. I.—*The Place of Theology in the Work and Growth of the Church.*[1]

THE study of theology may be looked at from several distinct points of view. It is manifest, in the first place, that a study which enters so deeply into the region of personal life, is capable not only of being loved and cultivated, but of being hated and proscribed. This is a character which in great measure distinguishes all the sciences that deal with man, from those that are concerned with nature. But the prerogative of appealing to the heart as well as to the intellect, belongs in peculiar measure to the topics with which theology concerns itself. No problems are so radical in their influence on the whole scheme of human life, as those that handle the existence, the nature, the revelation of God; and so the very right of theology to exist, and to discuss these things, becomes, in a pre-eminent degree, subject of fierce controversy. But even the enemies of theology are divided into several distinct camps. There are those who regard all theology as jugglery, because they hold all religion to be superstition. Religion is conceived

[1] This paper was delivered as the closing lecture of last session in the Free Church College, Aberdeen.

as a morbid condition, affecting certain stages of human development; and the study of its phenomena forms part of the science of social pathology. A more modern school of thinkers detects the unhistorical complexion of this view, observing that religion has exerted an unquestionable influence in carrying forward the moral and social development of our race. An active and useful factor in history cannot be a mere disease of humanity; but it is imagined that the truly beneficent forces of which religion has hitherto been the vehicle, have been clothed in a false idealism, and unnecessarily engrafted on transcendental theories as to the relation of man to God. It is held that a better social philosophy would enable us to find on earth all those ethical motives, and all those springs of bliss, which the imagination of early ages placed in heaven. And this new religion of humanity has no need for a theology, because it finds no place for a God. The religion of humanity is as yet in a somewhat undeveloped state, and its adherents are, for the most part, either unable or unwilling to lay down with logical precision the features that distinguish it from Christianity. But when we hear it asserted that religion is a necessary and an excellent thing, while theology, on the contrary, is useless or noxious, we may in general assume that we have to deal with a man who, more or less consciously, derives his views from the school in question. A religion without theology means, for the most part, a religion without God. It can mean nothing else in the mouth of any man who does not possess that mystical habit of mind, which conceives of communion with God as a state of the soul too purely passive to become an object of intellectual cognition, too purely individual to be the basis of a general doctrine. And this extreme form of mysticism is at present so rare and so uninfluential that it cannot be credited with any share in establishing the currency of the formula which contrasts religion with theology. That formula has a clear meaning only for the man who has satisfied himself that the really valuable elements of religion are quite separable from all belief in God, or in any other transcendental fact. It is a formula, therefore, which is so far from being the self-evident foundation of a new religious liberalism, that it

possesses no value for any man who has not got at it as the last result of an elaborate criticism of all religious ideas, who has not satisfied himself, by a strictly philosophical inquiry, that the transcendental convictions of Christianity are not the true mainsprings of Christian life, but simply an illogical projection into the superhuman sphere of notions, which have always had their reality and power only in immanent relations of a region purely human. When the assertion that theology perishes but religion remains passes from mouth to mouth, among men who have no pretensions to have even looked at these difficult problems of the philosophy of religion, who, being either destitute of all habits of exact thought, or occupied only with purely physical science, do not possess the most elementary qualifications for the researches which alone can give their words a meaning,—in the mouths of such men, the formula in question is nothing more than a cant phrase, which decently veils pretentious ignorance, or nothing less than a disguise of affected sentiment cast over the nakedness of shamefaced atheism.

Thus if we set aside, on the one hand, the objections drawn from a mysticism too exaggerated to deserve serious refutation, and, on the other hand, those derived from that old-fashioned atheism which, in its plain-spoken contempt for all religion, can so easily be proved unhistorical that even its friends are glad to disguise it in scraps of new-fashioned philosophy,—if we set both these classes of objections aside, it appears that the only serious attack which can be made on theology as a whole, must proceed from a system of the philosophy of religion not less elaborate in construction than Christian theology itself. The right of theology to exist can no longer be disputed *in limine*. The contest must now be between the developed systems of the philosophy of Christianity and the philosophy of the religion of humanity. Each of these systems must base its argument, not merely on speculative considerations, but on the closest study of the whole history of religion, especially of the religion of Christ. The battle with unbelief which in last century was fought on broad general grounds and with arguments addressed to the general intelligence, is now

resolving itself into a series of detailed contests, intelligible for the most part only to men specially trained, and extending over every theological discipline. True, this new phase in the contest between Christianity and infidelity has not yet been adequately realised by either side. Nor can a time ever come when those cruder forms of unbelief, which have their strength in passion and prejudice, shall cease to advance the old objections and call forth the old replies. But ever since the publication of Strauss's first Life of Jesus, the new conditions of the battle have been growing more and more visible. The more sober and cultivated opponents of our faith have ceased to regard theological studies as unworthy of their attention. Theology, it is admitted, can be overthrown only by theologians. Unlike those superstitions that vanish at once before the light of superior truth, Christianity can be subverted only by the most refined process of criticism operating against the detailed developments of Christian belief. This new wager of battle has not been refused by the defending camp. The critical study of Christianity has been taken up both by friend and foe, with an energy which indicates considerable revival of interest in exact theological research; and the conception of theology as a science, which in this country had very much dropped out of sight, is again impressed upon men's minds.

At first sight, the stimulus which has thus been given to theological inquiry seems very valuable. But before we give ourselves up to the unreserved self-congratulation which we hear around us, it is well that we should ask whether it is a wholesome thing that all theological interest is at present so exclusively supported by apologetical and polemical motives. We should ask whether such a theology is likely to be really fruitful, and whether such interest is likely to be really lasting. Both these questions, I apprehend, must be answered in the negative. Discussions which have for their object the defence or overthrow of Christianity as a whole, may indeed attach themselves to the detailed problems of theology, but cannot possibly devote to questions of detail the loving interest by which alone the sciences advance. Such discussions, therefore, can hardly be very

fruitful. Nor can they continue to inspire a wide and deep interest. For the apologetic problems are becoming yearly more intricate, so that, in an increasing degree, they either cease to interest all but a very few, or attract the attention of the many only when set forth in a superficial and inaccurate manner. The fact is, that no religion which contains within it such elements of power as still reside in Christianity, can be annihilated by a process of critical dissection. Both assailants and defenders will at last weary of this endless conflict of detail. The battle, which can never cease, will assume a new form. It is probable enough, that instead of a mere war of opinion, we may have to face attacks of a more practical kind. But at all events, the preparedness of the Church to meet a new onset can bear a very remote relation to the completeness with which an apologetic adapted to the present system of attack, has been organised. The merely propugnacular part of theology has very transitory value. A theology capable of doing permanent service, must not allow itself to be shaped with reference to the present attitude of unbelief. It must not, in the first instance, look at unbelief at all, but must be framed in accordance with a large and just view of the service which systematic Christian knowledge is able to do in promoting the internal growth and the natural work of the Church herself.

The point of this argument may perhaps become more clear if put in another way. Apologetic theology, though practical in its bearing on those who are without the Church, has, for those who are within the Church, either no value at all, or a value purely speculative. The most finished apologetic which can be conceived, would, in fact, be a complete theoretic delineation of the relations of the different parts of the Christian system, and a complete critical philosophy of the history of our religion. But as apologetic is entirely directed to persons who have no sympathy with the practical tasks that lie before the Church, the theoretic disciplines in question would, in the hands of the apologist, be necessarily framed in quite an abstract manner. And therefore, when all the unbelievers were convinced, a new and higher theological task would arise;

it would be necessary to recast the abstract theory of Christianity, and construct a practical theology for the guidance of the Church in the positive task of attaining the ideal set before her by her Lord. But of course a perfect apologetic can never be constructed by an imperfect Church. It is the actual imperfection of the existent state of the Church, much more than the theoretic imperfection of our present theology, which is the source of unbelief; and it is not possible to give a perfect theory of an imperfect organism. Thus not only the highest, but the most immediately practical task of theology, is to guide the internal growth and activity of the Church. Those who allow themselves to be carried away from this aim by the apparent urgency of danger from without, and who therefore, according to the fashion of the present day, direct their whole energies, as theologians, to apologetical tasks, misapprehend the real needs of the Church and the real sources of the weakness and the strength of Christianity, which is always invincible from without, except when weakened by corruption and divisions within.

It appears, then, when the thing is looked at more closely, that the extreme and one-sided development of apologetic in the recent theological literature of our country, is by no means an unambiguous sign of a healthy interest in theology. On the contrary, this is rather to be regarded as one of many signs that we are lamentably deficient in theological interest of the right kind, that we have very little sense of the real services which theology ought to perform for the Church and kingdom of Christ. When we observe that our whole theological literature, even when not apologetical in subject, is impregnated with an apologetic flavour; that the most popular commentaries, the most current works on doctrine, do little or nothing to carry theology forward to new results, and direct all their energy to the refutation of attacks from without, we are constrained to ask, whether the Church itself is likely to be aggressive, if her theology is purely defensive. But, in fact, the mass of men seem to think that, for all purposes except the refutation of new objections, our theology is already quite perfect enough. It is not felt that one main reason why the

Church falls short of her true ideal, is that the ideal has not yet been accurately conceived in thought.

But, in truth, where the need for a growing theology is not felt, the theological results which the Church has already reached are sure to be very inadequately mastered by individuals, and very imperfectly applied to the details of Church work. When the Church as a whole is quite content with the theology which she already possesses, individual ministers and students will very readily be content with the amount of theology which they already possess. If all our ministers were fully impressed with the conviction, that a thorough discharge of their ministry is only possible if they bring to bear on the details of their work the most developed theological grasp of the meaning of the Church and the Church's work as a whole, we should no longer have to complain of a stationary theology. But, in the meantime, the general indifference to the growth of theology finds its counterpart in individual indifference to theological acquisition and thought. If nothing new is brought out except in the way of sermons, books of practical religion, and apologetic, it is only natural that our ministers and students in great measure confine their reading to these less profitable topics, and that their pastoral efficiency is correspondingly impaired. Finally, this indifference to theology is not confined to the ministry. It is widely spread among the members of the Church, and takes shape in depreciation of the value of a regularly trained ministry, and in an inclination to believe that personal earnestness, some natural eloquence, and a fair measure of familiarity with the easier parts of the Bible, and perhaps with the Shorter Catechism, are all that can reasonably be thought necessary to fit a man for the office of a teacher in the Church.

Against all these delusions, we possess, humanly speaking, only one strong practical barrier—the institution of the divinity hall for the systematic training of our ministers. When we part for the session, after spending five months together in practical protest against tendencies which surround us on every side, and which sometimes threaten to exert an evil influence on our own minds, it is fit that we should endeavour to carry with us a clear conception of the

purpose and value of the methodical studies on which we have been engaged. I propose, therefore, to spend the rest of this lecture in an attempt to develop, in a constructive manner, the subject which in my remarks up to this point I have approached indirectly, and in the way of criticism of current habits of thought.

Christianity is a new life. The Christian takes his place in a society, where his life is guided by new motives, and supplied with strength arising from his new relation to God. Every point in this new situation implies knowledge of a quite definite kind. The believer's relation to God is not of the nature of a physical union, which can be realised in him without his knowing what kind of relation it is. The new motives that stir him have power only in proportion as they are intelligently grasped. He is not mechanically grafted into Christ, but becomes a member of the mystical body only in conscious submission to the Head. And the new strength of grace by which he lives, is not given magically by physical infusion, but morally, to those that seek it by prayer, and therefore with a real knowledge both of their need and of the way in which it must be supplied. In short, whatever of real living power there is in Christianity is *moral*, and deals with man as a conscious, intelligent personality, who is in no sense fulfilling the ends for which God placed him on the earth, if he is not fulfilling them in the free play of understanding and of will. A moral growth such as Christianity sets before us, means that every step in advance is deliberately taken in pursuit of a moral ideal already grasped in thought. It is, indeed, a law of such growth, that the ideal unfolds itself more and more perfectly as we come nearer to it, just as the towers and spires of a fair city display themselves with increasing clearness of detail to the pilgrim who approaches its gates. But the very first step of true advance towards the goal implies a true, though it may be only a general, knowledge of the ideal pursued. No kind of moral action, be it Christian or not, is an affair of pure subjectivity. All morality implies purpose, and all purpose is conditioned by antecedent knowledge of the thing proposed. If we refuse to apply this law to the Christian life, we degrade religion to a mere material thing,

and place it on one line with the functions of bodily growth. For every part of life that goes on working, whether it is understood or not, is physical, not moral. And so the theorist who proposes as possible a life in God which is not based on a knowledge of God, is really depicting Deity in the manner of pantheistic materialism, as a subtle principle of physical influence, which a man sucks in as he does the breeze and the sunshine.

This extreme antithesis to the position, that all real Christian life rests on true Christian knowledge, is characteristic of pronounced unbelief, with which in this part of our discussion we are no longer concerned. But even within the Christian Church, the pantheistic notion of God has always influenced a certain class of minds, and shows itself in that tendency to conceive spiritual and moral facts on the analogy of physical processes, which is technically called mysticism. The mystical schools incline to make Christianity an affair of feeling and instinct, rather than of knowledge and will; though, of course, where this tendency is limited by positive Christian motives, it results not in absolute denial, but only in certain modifications of the moral character of our religion. The palmy days of mysticism fall in the middle ages, and in these ages, it must be remembered, even the Catholic Church exempted a most weighty part of the spiritual energies of Christianity from the laws of moral action. The doctrine of the *opus operatum* in the sacraments unquestionably reduces certain features of the spiritual life to the level of a physical process, and this doctrine alone makes it possible for the Church of Rome to regard with complacency a degree of ignorance on the part of the laity, which is quite inconsistent with truly moral growth.

But in Protestantism, at least, it should be otherwise. When the Reformers taught that the means of grace are effective only in so far as they bring the *Word* of God into contact with personal faith, they distinctly asserted that all true religious life is morally nourished. For the Word of God meant to the Reformers the direct personal message of God's love in Christ; so that saving faith is neither a mere intellectual persuasion, nor a mere subjective habit of mind,

but the intelligent and moral outgoing of the personality and will towards a personal revelation of God. Hence the intense zeal with which early Protestantism threw itself on the study of the Bible, no longer seeking therein, with the middle ages, a body of intelligible truths not directly in contact with the practical Christian life, but that living voice of God Himself, which, heard and joyously received into the heart, becomes the direct principle of all spiritual growth.

This principle is formulated in our Larger Catechism, in the proposition that Christ communicates to His Church the benefits of His mediation by means of His ordinances, the word, sacraments, and prayer. With this must be taken the doctrine—which historically was the very starting-point of the Reformation—that the effectual factor in the sacraments is not the outward sign, but the word of promise signified. Thus the proposition is, that all participation in the benefits purchased by Christ, is to be gained in converse with God, in hearkening continually to His word, and in making thereto the answer of prayer and thanksgiving. All Christian life becomes a thing of the understanding and of the will. Each step towards Christian perfection is possible only in the form of conscious submission of the will to a promise or precept of God, definitely grasped by the mind. The operation of the Holy Spirit in the calling and sanctification of the believer does not substitute a new and incomprehensible process for this plain rule of moral growth, but only makes that growth possible, by enlightening the understanding and renewing the will.

Every endeavour to set forth the importance of theology to the Church must necessarily rest on a clear apprehension of the importance of Christian knowledge for the individual religious life. And I have thought it the more necessary to recall to you the characteristic attitude of Protestantism on this point, because, where theology is undervalued by persons standing within the Protestant Churches, it will very often be found that behind this there lies a wrong conception of the whole nature of Christian faith and life. Instead of the Christian life being conceived as a conscious converse with God, by the aid of the ordinary means of grace, an inclination will be found to imagine that the highest religious

experiences dispense with these means altogether. In extreme cases, of course, this tendency leads to claims of special inspiration. But it is not in its extremest forms that the tendency does most harm, for then its falseness is easily seen. More generally what is put in the place of the objective converse of faith with God, is some kind of subjective emotion or persuasion. Faith, instead of going outwards towards God in Christ, is turned inward upon itself. It is supposed that a man is saved by believing that he is saved, by gaining, through some kind of empirical experience, a conviction that he has passed from death to life. Of course such a faith is not belief in God, but in something internal to oneself, and therefore has no necessary relation to any true knowledge of God, and gives no starting point for a theology. But the people who hold these views still use the name of justification by faith, and so often imagine that they are sound Protestants. In reality they are a kind of Protestant mystics, greatly inferior to the old mystics in richness of æsthetic fancy and warmth of religious feeling; and when they become sufficiently conscious of their own position to separate themselves from the Church, they form these monotonous sects, whose one spiritual weapon is the ever repeated question, "Have you believed?" and whose theology consists wholly of abusive polemic and millenarian dreams.

It is plain from what has already been said, that the tendency to depreciate theology which marks a leaning towards these views, must be met in the first place by emphasising the true Protestant view of faith, and of its relation to the Word of God. It must not, however, be supposed, that when due stress is laid on these points, everything is done which is necessary to vindicate for theology its proper place. Indeed, at this part of the argument an error is frequently committed, which, though precisely opposite in character to that of the sects just characterised, is very nearly as fatal to a true understanding of the nature and business of theology. It is often said or implied, that because all true Christianity involves definite knowledge of God and His Word of Revelation, there is therefore no real difference between religion and

theology. The specific Christian knowledge which every believer possesses is called his theology, and is hastily identified with the theology of the Church in general. It is not of course pretended that every believer is necessarily master of all theology, but it is held that the knowledge indispensable to faith is, so far as it goes, theological.

Now it is to be observed, that the only kind of knowledge which it is necessary for every Christian to possess, is knowledge which stands in direct contact with faith and practice. It is not necessary that the knowledge in question be systematised, logically formulated, put into any scientific shape. It is not even necessary that he who has it shall be able to enounce it with precision in words, if it is always at hand to him when he wishes to act on it. In all practical ways of life there is a great deal of knowledge requisite which is perfectly definite, but which the practical man never learns to put into words. He has acquired his knowledge by practice. And so when any practical question arises, he *knows* the right thing to do, though perhaps he could not explain so as to make another know it. An extreme instance of the kind, which illustrates what I mean in the simplest form, is the power of hitting a mark with a stone. This involves a real and accurate intellectual judgment of the object, its distance, and so forth. Implicitly, this judgment contains applications of a number of laws of anatomy, optics, dynamics, but not one of these laws is present as a law to the mind of the actor. The same thing obviously holds good with regard to moral action. Take the personal converse of a little child with its father. This converse, which is one of faith, love, and obedience, is guided by a real knowledge of the father's love and the father's wishes. But the child could not describe its father's character, or tell you how it reads his meaning in his face. The knowledge is a real knowledge, serving as a foundation for true moral action, but it cannot be expressed in propositions.

It is certain that similar considerations apply to the case of Christianity. The early Christians had no formulated doctrine of the person of Christ, and no theory of the atone-

ment. But in a practical way they knew that Christ was a Divine Person, for they worshipped Him; and they knew that He had reconciled them with God, for they walked in the joyful consciousness of reconciliation. The Mediæval Church had no doctrine of justification by faith, yet certainly in all ages the Church is justified by faith.

Now, how does this bear on the position, that the specific Christian knowledge of the believer is always made up of theological propositions—differing only in extent and not in kind from a complete theological system? We have seen that true Christian knowledge is often unsystematic, even inarticulate, presenting itself to the mind of the believer not in the form of propositions, but only as a sound practical judgment in each special act of Christian life. To reconcile this fact with the notion that all faith implies a measure of theological knowledge, one of two things must be done. Either it must be urged, that however inarticulate much of the believer's knowledge is, there must always be some part of it, embracing essentials, which is clearly formulated; or, on the other hand, it must be maintained that clear formulation, logical arrangement, systematic structure, are not essential to theology at all. In general, I believe those who uphold the position which we are at present examining, are disposed to combine these arguments. But both arguments are inadequate, and both tend to establish a practical depreciation of theology.

Look first at the assertion, that every believer must at least have a definitely formulated knowledge about essentials, which is his theology. This argument is pertinent to establish the identity of theology with practical Christian knowledge, only on the assumption that it is the formulated part of his knowledge on which the Christian acts, the rest being really a superfluity. And this is obviously untrue, for the very doctrines which we rightly consider pre-eminently practical, were not formulated till a comparatively late date in the history of the Church. And without any appeal to history, it is enough to point to the fact, that genuine practical insight often keeps the simplest believer in the right path, on questions the theological discussion of which is full of subtleties. Here, obviously, we have action based not on

elementary formulated knowledge, but on deep inarticulate knowledge elaborated in practice. The argument, then, is powerless for the end proposed to it. But it is very powerful in leading people to undervalue theology. For when an eminent degree of practical Christian wisdom and goodness is found in a man whose explicit knowledge is scanty, this argument prevents people from seeing, that between these two things there lies a great development of unformulated knowledge. The importance of theology is supposed to be magnified by ignoring inarticulate knowledge altogether, and the result is, of course, that we have people saying on every hand, "What is the good of an elaborate theology, when a man who is so little a theologian as A or B is so excellent and so useful a man?" This is an objection which can only be answered by shewing, that the supposed useless elaborations of theology are just explicit statements of the very truths which, in an inarticulate form, in the shape of practical tact and insight, lie at the root of untheological wisdom.

I pass now to the second way of defending the notion that all true religious knowledge is theology. Theology is often taken in a loose sense, and permitted to include all manner of unsystematic illogical odds and ends of Christian thought and knowledge. A book of sermons, for example, or a volume of practical meditations, is taken to be a contribution to theology. In this loose sense of the word, at least, every Christian, it is maintained, has a theology.

But this is also a thoroughly false position. Loose, unshaped knowledge, never leads to clear and decided action. If a practical man can only tell in a rude, general way, the rules on which he works, you may be sure that he does not think of these rules at all in the actual process of his toil. The loose, vague rule is only an awkward attempt to express in words some piece of knowledge of which he has a practical grasp, perfectly firm and definite. In fact, vague and inaccurate theological generalisations are only a hindrance to Christian life. All generalised knowledge, which is not scientifically precise in its expression, contains some element of positive error, and applied in practice may very readily prove misleading. It will be found that the

simple Christian argues safely only when, by direct personal sympathy with the personal word of God, he takes it home to his own special case without any generalisation whatever. He does this with the perfectly definite knowledge that the word is spoken by God to *him;* but this personal appropriation of a personal message of love, is surely not by any straining of words to be called theology.

Let me, in a word, sum up this part of our argument. Personal Christianity is not a play of subjectivities, but moral converse with God practically dominating the life. Such converse is necessarily intelligent: there is no faith without knowledge. But the essential quality of the knowledge is its personal and practical character. The believer must be able to say, I know that God speaks *thus* to *me;* that He gives me such a hope in my present trouble, such a command as to present duty. But this personal knowledge is not, for the most part, reached by making a special application of a general truth: it is got at by sympathetic appropriation of the concrete and personal utterances of God's Word. It is a mistake to call such knowledge theology. For however the notion of theology is stretched, it always must, to a certain extent, imply a knowledge which can be put into words, and so imparted to a man who has not shared the experience of him who imparts it. And of such knowledge a most experienced Christian may have very little, and that little very loose and inaccurate. And if it is supposed that this theology is really what his faith feeds on and his life is guided by, we must draw the inaccurate and dangerous inference, that a most rudimentary theology is practically quite as serviceable as the completest system of truth.

But, says one, if theology is not that by which individual Christians live; if, on the contrary, the great majority of Christians have theological notions so defective that any attempt to live by them exclusively would do more harm than good, what is the use of theology at all? And the answer to this question is, that the use of theology is to direct the administration of the Church.

So long as Christianity is looked upon as a purely individual thing, a converse of me by myself, and of you by your-

self, with God in Christ, it is really not possible to make out for theology a sphere of genuine practical importance. For strictly individual religion, that growth in knowledge and spiritual wisdom which is got by pure practice without generalisation or system, seems adequate enough. But the moment we begin to contemplate Christianity as a social thing, as organised into a Church, we reach a point where inarticulate knowledge of divine truth breaks down.

Let us consider what sort of Christian society it is possible to form, on the hypothesis that every member has just that knowledge which is directly given in his own personal religious experiences. Every society is bound together by a common aim and common principles. This society must be bound together by its common Christianity. But the Christianity of each man presents itself to him, on the hypothesis, only in the form of strictly individual religious experiences and frames of thought, so that the only bond of Christian union possible is similarity of experience in details, identity of individual frames and habits of mind. The society which arises when men come together on this ground, is a society of the like-minded, all busy with their common religious experiences. The principle of union goes no farther than the similarity of experience. Two men, whose Christian lives have run different courses, are, in proportion to the extent of this difference, debarred from Christian fellowship. We all recognise the description of such a society. It is not the Church, but the conventicle, the *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, the fellowship of separatists and sectarians. It is a society which can never be catholic, never a spiritual might, never permanent; never catholic, for its breadth of comprehension is limited by purely individual accidents of Christian experience; never a spiritual might, for the attraction of homogeneous individuals means the repulsion of the heterogeneous; never permanent, for if it does not split up in the first generation by the development of different types in the farther experience of those who started from a common point, it must at least fall to pieces in the next generation, from the certainty that the children will not be like the parents.

It appears, then, that the assertion that mere personal,

inarticulate knowledge, serves all the necessities of Christian growth, is necessarily bound up with another assertion,—namely, that the whole growth of Christianity on earth is simply the sum of the independent growths of individuals; that Christian fellowship is not an essential factor in Christian life, but merely an ornamental addition to that life,—a pleasure which the believer enjoys when he falls in with men of like religious tastes, not a Christian duty towards men even of unlike tastes. But all Christianity which has any pretence to be catholic, not sectarian, proceeds on very different principles, remembering that, according to the New Testament, it is the Church as an organic unity that is the object of God's electing love and of Christ's redeeming work, and that each member of the mystical body of Christ grows up towards Him who is the Head only in sympathy with the growth of the whole body. On this view, Christian fellowship is an essential thing; and like all the essentials of Christianity, it is a thing which cannot be left to be secured by unconscious agencies. It is true that every believer is *ipso facto* a member of the organic body of Christ. But this membership is a moral, not a physical fact, and thus it is a supreme Christian duty to give practical and conscious realisation to the truth that growing union to Christ means fellowship in the united growth of all them that are His. The Church, therefore, is a divine ordinance, in which men of all possible types of religion, and in every stage of spiritual growth, are to come together on the broad ground of professed faith in Christ and obedience to Him, and unite in such common activities as shall give fit expression to their unity and conduce to common edification.

There can be no difficulty in deciding the nature of the common exercises in which the Church of Christ expresses its conscious catholicity and seeks common edification. The fellowship of the Church is oneness in fellowship with God in Christ; the growth of the Church is increasing nearness to God of the life of the whole society. Thus the proper activity for which the Church is visibly organised is just to sist itself before God in visible oneness of faith,

thanksgiving, and prayer. Wherever the fellowship of believers is able to lay hold of the Gospel promise with common faith, to raise to God the voice of common thanksgiving, to unite with one mind in common confession and joint petitions; there the unity of all believers in Christ receives a fitting practical utterance, and the whole Church is edified together.

At first sight this appears a very simple thing, so simple that it may seem impossible that it should fail to be realised wherever there is true Christianity at all. But a glance at the present divided state of Christendom is enough to shew that this is not so, and that the attainment of an object, apparently so easy, really requires Christian wisdom and Christian knowledge of no ordinary kind. However simple the elements of Christianity may be, their simplicity is that of a living germ, not of a mechanical complex, and they are therefore capable of development into an endless variety of distinct types of life and feeling. And because of the continued presence of sin and imperfection in the Church, not one of these types will be a pure type. All will err, both by unequal development of certain Christian motives to the neglect of others, and by the admixture of motives which are not Christian at all. Nor does this divergence between brethren in Christ end in the establishment of personal types not perfectly sympathetic. Personal differences become embodied in formulated opinions and definite courses of action, and so the unity of all believers is confronted with the sharp antagonism of parties.

On the sectarian theory, at which we have already glanced, this state of things is accepted as inevitable. No attempt is made to give practical expression to the catholicity of the Church. The like-minded simply come together, and remain together as long as they can. The unlike-minded are suffered to depart, and, in the stricter forms of sectarianism, are even supposed to have no share in Christ. An opposite extreme characterises the Broad Church. It is observed that the divergent tendencies of Christians become fixed in the antagonism of parties only when allowed to take shape in explicit doctrines and courses

of action. It is suggested, therefore, that the catholicity of the Church may be secured by avoiding all such explicitness. Let it be understood that constructive theology, which has so long placed barriers between the Churches, has a purely speculative and individual interest. The bond of Christian love should be sufficient to secure unity among Christians, whatever their individual type may be. This theory is so vague in all points that it is difficult to criticise it. But it is obvious that no society can be organised simply on mutual love. Organised fellowship implies common interests, a common aim, some function in which the whole society visibly combines. In a word, the Church is not the fellowship of Christian love—which requires no unity of organisation—but the fellowship of Christian worship. The common worship of many individuals must be the expression in intelligible form of their common relation of faith towards God. We have already seen that all personal faith implies personal knowledge. The intelligent expression of faith therefore implies explicit and formulated knowledge. Put face to face with this argument the Broad Church breaks at once into two camps. The one camp gives up the conception of the Church as the fellowship of worship, and proposes to have a national church simply as an instrument of national culture, a view essentially Socinian. The other camp proposes either to omit everything from worship with which some may differ, or aims at a spirit of Christian charity which shall enable a man to be edified even by expressions of a faith which is not his own. On the first alternative, the Church must perish from inanition; on the second, worship becomes a mere sentimental enjoyment, and is no longer a real approach to God through Christ. But both the Sectarians and the Broad Church forget that church-fellowship has a moulding and upbuilding power on those who take part in it, that all believers are led by the one Spirit of Christ, and that the unity of faith is stronger than the diversity of personal experience. It is not the shallowest and most jejune apprehension of Christianity which forms the basis for a worship truly Catholic. A full and all-sided development of Christian motives cannot fail to appeal to all true

faith, if its fulness is not that of individual fancy, but of generalisation from the normal data of the Bible. Wheresoever the mind of Christ is set forth, there faith will be awakened and instructed. Men of diverse experience will not, indeed, lay hold with equal fulness and readiness on every aspect of Christian truth; but a truth really Christian, when set forth in a devotional shape, will at length draw forth the sympathy of every child of God.

These considerations, I think, make it clear enough what the real problem of Church administration is, and in what direction its solution must be sought. The object to be attained is the practical expression of the catholic faith of the Church in acts of worship, in which the fellowship of believers unites to the praise of the glory of God in Christ. The faith that utters itself in such acts is necessarily articulate, otherwise there could be no conscious fellowship. If the articulate utterance of faith expresses only the personal experience of an individual, the like-minded alone are edified; if it avoids everything that is definite, no one is edified at all. But the extremes of Sectarianism and the Broad Church may both be avoided, if we observe that there is such a thing as a normal Christian faith, which is in fact the faith of the Church made perfect, and which has the power to draw all believers to it; that whenever this normal faith is intellectually apprehended in all its bearings, and practically applied to the administration of every function of the Church, the Church has attained to catholicity, and that on this external unity cannot fail to follow. Thus the unity of the Church is not impracticable as the Sectarians suppose—nor is it to be attained by compromise and mutual toleration on the principles of the Broad Church. Catholicity must be produced by the internal growth of the individual communions which actually exist, before it can be manifested in the disappearance of Church parties in an outward unity. The catholicity of an ecclesiastical communion means nothing else than that all its functions are so adjusted, that in them every truly Christian impulse of the believing heart towards God finds utterance, and that every side of the gospel message is fully set forth to faith. And failures in catholicity are of two kinds; (1), failures

lying in the direction of sectarianism—the admission into the constitution and worship of the Church of elements of local and temporary value, distinctive principles—political, national, or personal—which go beyond normal Christianity; and (2), failures lying in the direction of the Broad Church, that is, the omission to make prominent genuine Christian motives which are capable of social expression. The Church is now imperfect and divided, because there is no communion which is free from defects in both these directions; but every communion deserves the name of catholic only in proportion as it sets before it as the ideal aim of all Church administration to attain more and more fully to the expression in every social function of a full-grown, all-sided, and normal faith.

Thus the progress of the Church depends on the presence of two things—*first*, a vigorous theology, diligently engaged in bringing into clearer light all sides of Christian truth, giving to each Christian motive and belief its due prominence and right place in a comprehensive system, and placing in the light of this knowledge the present attainments of the Church. And with this must be conjoined in the *second* place a wise administration, by which every gain of insight into the ideal to which the Church has to attain is duly applied in government, discipline, and worship, so that the new insight, which is in truth nothing more than the explicit development of something involved in all true faith, may now be consciously presented to the whole community, and find an answer in the hearts of all.

To recapitulate: The functions of the Church as the society of public worship are imperfect, unless discharged in a way corresponding to the ideal unity of the fellowship of the Redeemed. Thus all Church worship must aim at catholicity, and genuine catholicity is the principle that must guide the whole government and administration of the Church. But catholicity does not mean toleration and compromise. It means the gathering up of all aspects of truly Christian converse with God into a unity of devotional expression in which every believer can join. This is an ideal remote from the present state of the Churches. But it is an ideal that must at length be realised. For it is

certain that a normal expression of Christian faith has the power of appealing to every believer, and of doing so, not in virtue of any abstractness and hazy generality, but just in proportion to the fulness with which it takes up everything that lies in the whole compass of Christian truth. Such a normal statement of Christian faith, rich in all Christian knowledge, but freed from everything of human idiosyncrasy, is what every communion that claims to be a branch of the Church Catholic must seek to attain by theological research, and to apply to the constant improvement of the practical administration of Church functions. A Church which ceases to theologise ceases in the same moment to grow, while conversely, from the constant action and reaction that connect knowledge and practice in all moral organisms, a Church whose life grows dull, will also cease to theologise aright.

And now let me, in conclusion, draw some practical deductions as to the value of theology as a preparation for office in the Church.

When we say that every living Church must have a living theology, we do not, in accordance with our argument, imply that every Church member must be familiar with the theology of the communion to which he belongs. On the contrary, our argument has been that a Church becomes capable of attracting and edifying *every* true Christian, whatever his stage of knowledge and growth may be, just in proportion as every act of public worship and every ecclesiastical function rests on full and normal theological attainments. Public worship is not a theological exercise in which men meet on the basis of common scientific knowledge; it is an exercise of common faith, in which the gospel message is personally set forth and received with personal affection and obedience. Thus no theology is required in order that a man may with edification join in the worship of the Church. Theology is the affair of him who conducts that worship, the system of knowledge by which he is enabled to lead the service, not as a man calling on the like-minded to sympathise with his own personal experience, but as one who, out of the riches of an all-sided grasp of the fulness of the gospel, can bring forth words of promise and admonition,

words of thanksgiving and prayer, suited to every Christian need, and yet free from all individualism. And what is true of the central function of public worship, is true of every Church act. There is indeed no act of government or discipline in which Church rulers can deal with imperial authority, indifferent to the necessity of carrying with them the mind of the whole Church. But it is not necessary that each Church member should have the knowledge requisite to judge for himself from the first on all questions of administration. It is Church rulers that must use their special knowledge to solve each practical question; but the question is not solved till the decision upon it is put into a form which, expressing the mind of Christ Himself, and so appealing directly even to uneducated faith, does carry with it the hearty sympathy of the faith of the whole Church.

Thus our principle assumes the practical shape that no Church act, whether of policy, discipline, or worship, can be rightly conducted except on the basis of a sound theology, and with such an application of theological principles as shall appeal to personal faith. The application of this rule demands a combination in the government of the Church of theological attainments with practical tact and sympathy with the untheological Christian, which is very fitly acknowledged in our Presbyterian system of Church Courts. But it is to be observed that Presbyterianism distinctly provides, what there is now some inclination to forget, that no exercise of Church power shall take place, and no ordinance be administered, except under the presidency or with the active participation of men theologically trained. That is, the Presbyterian theory is strictly in accordance with the result of our argument, and is violated when a man who has not been duly recognised as adequately instructed in the theology of the Church takes upon him any such independent and individual piece of administration as the conducting of an ordinary diet of worship. The equality of the elder with the minister in acts of rule does not, in the sense of Presbyterianism, imply indifference to the position that every Church act must be theologically directed, but is the practical expression of the principle that theological knowledge is not rightly applied to practical questions, when it is not so applied as to carry the

conviction of God-fearing and right-minded men who are not theologians.

Thus every candidate for the ministry who contemplates a sphere of life in which he shall be called to administer Church ordinances, to supply general principles of Christian knowledge for the whole internal administration of a congregation, and at the same time to take an active part among the technically instructed members of the higher courts, is looking forward to a life-work for which the first and most indispensable qualification is a sound and thorough knowledge of theology. A minister who is not a theologian may be a useful man in his parish in the way in which an influential private Christian or a good ruling elder is useful, but it is wholly impossible that he can do well that work for which the Church places him in ministerial office.

The failure will be most striking and inevitable in the pulpit, though perhaps it is just in the pulpit that such men most readily imagine themselves strong. Many, it is to be feared, go forward to the ministry with the conviction that the necessary conditions of effective pulpit work are not at all theological, but consist merely in personal earnestness, combined with certain powers of vigorous expression and a measure of literary culture. It is thought that a congregation must be interested by good expression and literary grace, in order that so they may be edified by sympathy with the expression of the minister's faith. And so plausible does this view appear to many, that it is more than hinted that the ideal divinity hall would be half a prayer-meeting and half a school of rhetoric and style. But, in truth, rhetorical or literary culture has just the same value to a minister as to any other public man. Purely literary interest is wholly out of place in the pulpit, when it ceases to stand in direct subordination to the devotional aim of the service. It is no merit in a sermon that it is attractive to those who have not come together with the single motive of common edification in joint worship. But the man who, when his words are stripped of literary varnish, has nothing to offer for the people's edification but sympathy with his own faith, is not fit to be a minister. It is the Bible which is the true manual of a catholic religious life; and the Bible, not interpreted by that

personal experience which only culls stray flowers from its pages, but set forth through diligent study in that many-sided fulness by which it supplies the Church's every need. That is no scriptural and no catholic knowledge in which the normal religious experience of the Old and New Testament is applied to the worship of the congregation only through the non-normal vehicle of uninspired experience. A man who handles God's word thus may sometimes, if his piety is deep and his personality strong, become a great influence. He may even be instrumental in saving souls ; but, on the whole, his ministerial work will weaken the Church. Working always under the guidance of his own partial and impure religious life, he will carry with him the like-minded, and will fail to edify others. All men whose minds are not of a peculiar type will cease to be edified. The all-sided growth of the congregation, which depends mainly on the right and profitable administration of gospel ordinances, will sustain a grievous check. The few like-minded who retain some semblance of congregational vigour will grow more and more narrow and one-sided, being nourished, not on the sincere milk of the Word, but on so much thereof as the minister can himself assimilate; and the usual marks of a sectarian development will appear in the alienation of the children of the congregation, whose places are taken by deserters from other churches. Of all the temptations to which the student of theology is exposed, there is none more insidious, and none more dangerous, than the temptation to excuse want of diligence in study by concentration on the qualification of personal piety. There is no path of Christian duty in which a man can walk, unless he walks also near to God; but, for this very reason, no advance in Christian life is in itself a qualification for one sphere of usefulness more than for another. Nay, a high degree of spirituality cannot be maintained by any man except in the discharge of duties for which he is properly qualified. The man therefore who seeks the office of the ministry in reliance on his personal piety and earnestness of purpose, will not only be deceived in his hopes of usefulness, but grievously perils his spiritual life. Personal piety is no call to the ministry, unless it is also a call to full and zealous preparation for the ministry.

If the central function of presidence in Gospel ordinances is entrusted by our Presbyterian system only to men theologically trained, the minister is associated in all other parts of his congregational work with untrained elders. But the minister who is supported by the Church in order that he may give his whole time to functions which the elders discharge voluntarily, manifestly lies under special responsibility in these duties also. In all congregational matters the minister is justly expected to take a leading part, not only in the amount of work he does, but in the way he does it. Yet it is absurd to expect that in natural talent, in Christian experience, in good sense and tact, the minister shall excel all his elders. Even that pre-eminence which comes of greater practice is not possessed by a young minister who is called to preside in a court of old and experienced men. What the Church reckons on in placing a young unpractised man in such a position, is simply his theological training, his acquaintance with large views of truth, large principles of administration, deduced from the careful study of the Bible and the history of the Church. The minister who is really thus equipped will not fail to take the right place in his congregation, and to win corresponding respect; for all men feel that he has a claim to preside in practical matters who is able to throw on them the light of general principles. But the minister who is not a theologian is nowhere weaker than in his own session or in the midst of his congregation. He has no principles of knowledge which can give him a wide grasp of administrative questions. He maintains, therefore, only that influence which is due to his purely personal qualities, or which he can assert by clerical pretentiousness—by claiming for his office, as an office, the respect which is due to the right performance of its functions. He becomes a leader only to those weaker than himself, and the best office-bearers, who should be his greatest helpers, either wholly overshadow him or become objects of jealousy and centres of party feeling. There is no such source of congregational divisions as an ignorant ministry.

It is hardly necessary to remark that the theology which our argument contemplates as the proper preparation for congregational work, does not mean such a congeries of private

peculations as some men pride themselves upon. A theology seful for practical work consists mainly (1.) of Biblical knowdge, and (2.) of a grasp, both dogmatical and historical, of nat system based on the Bible which is embodied not only ı the constitution but in the consciousness of the Church. he man who is not prepared to discharge his functions in the ense of the Church, has no right to stand in the ministry; ne pretension to subordinate the worship of a congregation ) personal conclusions of speculative theology, is in spirit ectarian, and must always be resisted by Church-government. n appreciative mastery of the Church's present theology, ith a recognition of its positive value for practical work, is the ue basis of ministerial usefulness, and in congregational natters will seldom fail to supply adequate guidance even to man destitute of theological originality. But the future of ur Church depends on the solution of problems not purely ongregational.

Every attentive student of the past history of Scottish resbyterianism, and especially of the last few years, must dmit that the larger problems that lie before a Church which ims at visible catholicity, are not yet even theoretically solved -that they remain problems partly because our higher Church ourts are not sufficiently skilled in the practical application of ur present theological ideas, but partly also because these leas themselves are on many points too unclear and defective ) serve present needs. The history of late events has shewn nat even those branches of the Scottish Church which have eed themselves from the hampering tutelage of the State ill fall short, not only in knowledge of one another, but in ear comprehension of their own principles.

The fusion of separate communions has proved impossible, ainly because of the lack of true unity in our own Church; ecause with much brotherliness of spirit, and much common al for the advancement of Christ's cause, there is not that ear oneness of Church consciousness which it is the object of growing theology to supply. The problem of advance in sible catholicity remains unsolved, partly because a sound octrinal and historical appreciation of the present theology of ne Church in its relation to present needs is not diffused roughout the ministry, or even among leaders in our

ecclesiastical courts, and partly because theology has not yet spoken any decisive and convincing word on the questions of the day; because during two hundred years of Church life there has been hardly any marked advance in the Church's systematic knowledge.

It is plain that the supply of these two defects must go hand in hand. Only by diffusing through the whole ministry a higher ideal of theological attainments, a greater aptitude for theological reasoning, a fuller understanding of the historical personality of the Church, can we ensure that those men shall come to the front who are able to deal with practical questions in a way truly catholic; and that when the right solution of a problem is set forth, its adequacy shall be generally realised.

Unquestionably this is the first step to the removal of present evils. No novel speculations, no new theological lights, can save a Church which has not learned thoroughly to understand and appreciate her present constitution. But withal it must be remembered that the theological consciousness of the Church requires not only to be awakened, but to be guided forward to higher conceptions of the truth. The doctrine of theological finality can never be accepted, save in a Church very ignorant of her own principles, or very indifferent to their practical application. It is not well that long years of bitter conflict should be necessary to produce the conviction, that on one very secondary point of doctrine and constitution, our theology has not yet reached completeness. On the basis of a thorough knowledge of what has been already obtained, it is the constant business of the Church, in knowledge as in practice, to reach on to more perfection. And this must be sought, not only by the private labours of individuals, but by the organised effort of the Church as a whole to increase her provision for the acquisition and the advance of sound science. That Church is not wise which grudges to spend her best wisdom, her ablest men, her richest means, on the twofold task of theological research and theological instruction.

W. R. SMITH.

## Art. II.—*The Synagogue and the Church.*

### (Second Paper.)

N sketching the story of the Synagogue and the Church of the middle ages in a previous paper, we selected one page ɔm the many-leaved narrative as representative of the whole. ı entering on the post-Reformation period, we shall likewise ıdeavour to gain a view of the entire field by following the ɜvelopment in a single case. We turn to Germany, the rthplace of Protestantism, the land of experiment in faith ıd morals.

When the light of the Reformation broke over Europe, ghting up men's minds with the knowledge of a more excel- nt Christianity, and destroying in their hearts those ancient *ola* which had so long been buttressed on their shrines by norance and superstition, a new era began to dawn upon e House of Israel. The antagonism hitherto subsisting ıtween the Synagogue and the Church gradually began to ɜe much of its former sharpness of outline. In the wide alm of intellectual effort which liberty of thought and nscience had suddenly thrown open to all comers, no dis- ıction could possibly be made between Jew and Gentile. freer intercourse began to obtain between the two parties; ıd as a necessary consequence a spirit of tolerance and utual respect was engendered, which materially aided in ırying the bitter memories of the past. The marked ange which had become apparent in the whole tone of ıristian society could not fail to awaken the wonder of the ɜws, and to bring them to inquire into its nature and cause. . the first gush of Christian love and zeal after the emanci- ıtion of Christendom, it seemed at one time as if the nversion of Israel was about to become the first concern and ief aim of the Lutheran Church. At the outset Luther's art beat high with the hope of the speedy conversion of the ɜws, and, through their missionary zeal and labours, of an gathering of the nations to the fold of Christianity so rapid at it should be for the whole world as life from the dead. e wrote a little book, afterwards translated into Latin by

Justus Jonas, shewing "that Jesus was by birth a Jew," in which this lofty hope is very apparent throughout. In this work he ascribes the Jews' hardness of heart to the unworthy treatment they had met with at Christian hands for so many centuries, or, as he strongly puts it, at the hands of "our fools, popes, bishops, sophists, and monks." "If," he continues, "the apostles, who were themselves Jews, had dealt with us Gentiles in the same manner as we have dealt with their brethren, certes, not one Gentile had ever become a Christian. Since, therefore, they have acted so brotherly towards us Gentiles, let us, in return, act brotherly towards the Jews in the hope of converting some of them." It is saddening to note how the great Reformer's views upon this point radically changed in later life. In a subsequent work he thus expresses himself: "It is just as hard to convert the Jews as to convert the devil. A Jewish heart is hard as wood, or stone, or iron, so that it can no way be touched. In one word, they are all young devils condemned to hell."[1] He did not hesitate to recommend that violent measures should be used to force them to baptism. In consequence of this remarkable and most unhappy change of sentiment on the part of Luther, the idea of direct mission work among the Jews was abandoned, and long remained in abeyance in the Church he founded.

Nevertheless the Reformation exercised indirectly an enormous spiritual influence upon the Jews in Germany. The more liberal study of Christianity and the Church, in the new and better light in which they were now held forth to view, the freer intercourse with Christians, the more diligent study of the sacred writings, now translated into the language of the people, and, above all, the higher Christian tone that had begun to manifest itself in all Christian circles, resulted in bringing over to the truth many earnest spirits from the ranks of Judaism.

Among these a high place is due to Paulo Riccio, the celebrated professor at Padua, and subsequently Court physician of the Emperor Maximilian I. Addicted to astrologic and cabalistic studies, he managed to get involved in fierce

[1] Compare the quotations from Luther's Works in Hengstenberg's "Opfer der heiligen Schrift, Die Juden und die christliche Kirche." Berlin: 1859. p. 52, f.

controversy with Eck, who had denied the theory advanced in his treatise, *De Coelesti Agricultura*, regarding the inhabitation of the planets. Erasmus held Riccio in the highest esteem,[1] calling him "a soul born for the graces and for friendship." He endeavoured, by means of philosophy, to convince his brethren of the higher claims of Christianity, and did good service in encouraging the community against the Turks, who were then threatening Christendom.

Another eminent proselyte, Rabbi Johannes Isaac Levita, deserves special notice. Whilst engaged in translating, for the purpose of refuting it, Johann Drakonites' Commentary on the 53d chapter of Isaiah, the news was brought to him that his aged father had embraced Christianity, and been publicly baptised. Deeply moved by this event, he studied more attentively the work on which he was engaged. A new light broke over the prophetic page. He recognised the "Servant of the Lord" in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and believing the report of the Gospel, was baptised into the Church of Christ. His veneration and love for Luther were so great, that on the Reformer's death he wrote a "Lamentation" for him, called the Zionide, and fashioned after the model of the Hebrew lamentation for King Josiah. More valuable are his works on Hebrew Grammar, produced during his professorate in Cologne. He was a determined enemy of the Jesuits in his day, and wrote several treatises against them. His contemporary and friend, Paul Staffelsteiner, known prior to his conversion as Nathan Ahron, was appointed theological professor in Heidelberg, and wrote a Commentary on the 22d Psalm, in which he demonstrated, in opposition to the usual Rabbinical exposition, its prophetic reference to the crucifixion of the Messiah.

Perhaps the most valuable immediate result of the Reformation upon the Jews was the publication in their vernacular of the New Testament. A German proselyte, Johann Harzuge, published the first Hebrew translation of it, printed with rabbinical types, in Cracow in 1540. Numerous editions of portions, especially the Gospels, followed, and were read with eager curiosity by the Jews. Reference may here be made to

[1] In a letter, dated 10th March 1516, Erasmus says: "Paulus Riccius sic me proximo colloquio rapuit, ut mira quaedam me sitis habeat cum homine saepius et familiarius conserendi sermones."

one distinguished name, that of Matthäus Hadrianus,[1] who translated into Hebrew the Lord's Prayer, the Salutation of Mary, and the *Salve Regina*. He was by birth a Spaniard, but filled a professorial chair in Loewn, where he succeeded in creating great enthusiasm among his students for the study of Hebrew letters. He made no public profession of Christianity, and was never baptised, but the character of a true disciple cannot be denied him. He lectured for a time under Luther's auspices at Wittenberg.

It was customary in this age for those Jews who had embraced Christianity to engage in controversy, sometimes of the bitterest character, with their former brethren. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a multitude of pamphlets made their appearance, all designed to hold up the Hebrew faith and observances to public ridicule. Chief among these polemics was Johann Pfefferkorn, whose celebrated controversy with Reuchlin has preserved his name from a well-merited oblivion. He was baptised in 1506, and, having been taken up by the Dominicans, forthwith began to issue pamphlets of the most scurrilous kind against his former faith and brethren. He went so far as to declare in one of his writings, quite in the style of his patrons, that those obstinate Jews who refused baptism should be banished from the land; and in case the civil power declined to exercise its authority in this direction, the people should unite in forcing their rulers to free them from the curse of having such unbelievers dwelling among them. Notwithstanding the insignificance of the writer, and the palpable absurdity of his arguments, he actually succeeded in obtaining an Imperial edict in 1509 empowering the priests to enter Jewish houses, and seize and destroy all Hebrew books and documents, with the single exception of the sacred writings. It was this edict which called forth the controversy with Reuchlin. This distinguished scholar, whose opinion had been asked in reference to the measure, presented a detailed report to the Imperial Commissary, Uriel of Mayence (1510), in which he condemned the edict in strong terms, asserting that its only result would be to compel the Jews to

[1] In a letter to Ægidius Burlidius in 1518, Erasmus pays a tribute to this eminent scholar: "Hebraicæ literaturæ sic peritus, ut mea sententia non alium habeat hæc ætas, qui cum eo conferri possit. Exposui theologis, qualis sit, neque dubitarim meo recipere periculo: hunc unum esse hac actate, qui nobis fuerit omnibus votis expetendus" (Epist. iii. 39).

print their books for the future in Italy or Holland instead of Germany. To this declaration Pfefferkorn published a rejoinder, in which he assailed Reuchlin in terms of coarse invective. A controversy arose which lasted over many years, but which space forbids us to follow. The most enlightened and pious men of the age, including such names as Erasmus, Hess, Cäsarius, Luther, and Hutten, sided with Reuchlin, though regretting the tone of bitterness into which he was sometimes hurried. In a letter to Erasmus, *e.g.*, he thus speaks of his opponent: "Hoc monstrum, hoc prodigium, Hebionem corpore, Thersitem animo, audacia furentem, scelus anhelantem, pestem mihi nefarie molientem," &c. The remarkable work, *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, was the most lasting product of the conflict. In it the ignorance and impudence of Pfefferkorn and his Dominican friends and patrons were exposed with such fine and pointed satire that all Germany laughed with the Humanists at the monks and their ways. The final result of the whole controversy was, that Reuchlin not only vanquished his assailants, but succeeded also in rescuing from oblivion a large number of Hebrew works of inestimable value in the interpretation of the Old Testament, and in creating an interest in the study of the Hebrew language, which produced the happiest results when, at a later period, organised mission work began. From our present standpoint it is interesting to note the instructive cross-light thrown by the controversy on the relations subsisting in that age between the church and the synagogue. It is a curious and significant sign of the times to find a Jew attacking his own ancestral faith with all the force of a scurrilous invective, whilst the most eminent and enlightened Christian doctors take sides against him and unite in defence of the assailed.

Another remarkable feature of the situation in the sixteenth century was the benevolent and Christian disposition evinced by reigning German princes to promote a knowledge of Christian doctrines among their Jewish subjects. The princes of Hesse and Darmstadt were specially active in this direction. The only thing open to censure in the measures adopted by them was that Jews were forced to attend the lectures and disputations got up for their instruction. But,

notwithstanding this defect in the means employed, the spirit of love that prompted the measure was felt and appreciated, and a considerable number were converted to the truth. It is worthy of note that the singing of hymns in the churches proved more effective in many cases than the arguments of the preachers in opening Jewish hearts to the Gospel.

Three men deserve special notice for the zeal and success with which they laboured in this age to convert the House of Israel to the faith of the gospel. These were Esdras Edzard in Hamburg, Spener in Francfurt, and Count Zinzendorf, the father of the Moravian Church.

Edzard, a merchant of great wealth, had found time to acquire, under Buxtorff's tuition, an accurate and extensive knowledge of Hebrew literature. So distinguished were his attainments, that a professorship was several times offered him. But filled with love for his Saviour's brethren after the flesh, he resolved to devote himself exclusively to mission work among them. The respect and veneration in which he was held by all classes of his fellow-citizens procured for him ready access to Jewish houses, and by his extreme kindliness of spirit, as well as by the rational method in which he prosecuted his labours, he succeeded in making many converts. Over his proselytes he watched with a care that was truly fatherly. Every Wednesday and Saturday evening he assembled them in his house for conversation on Christian evidences and experience. On Friday evenings the circle was opened to receive all who might come. On these latter occasions his guests came with the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures in their hands; difficult points of interpretation were discussed; and at intervals hymns were sung and prayers offered. Two days before his death (1708) the venerable man gathered as many of his spiritual children as were within reach around his bed, and exhorted them to continue stedfast in the doctrines of the faith he had taught them. Provision was made in his will that the interest of a large sum of money should be devoted annually to the furtherance of the object which had lain nearest his heart during life. His sons, George and Sebastian, continued the work; and when they too were called away from their labours, the Senate of Hamburg undertook the management and continued support of the Institute they had founded. In course of time it gradually sank into

obscurity, and has now lost all significance. Still Edzard's labours were abundantly blessed in his day; and there are many Christian families in the old Hanse town whose ancestors were converted from Judaism through his instrumentality. It must not be forgotten, however, that Edzard received very material assistance in his missionary labours from the arbitrary laws then obtaining in his native community. One provision in particular of the old Hamburg Code, which compelled all Jewish parents to send their children to Christian schools until they had completed their fourteenth year, furthered his cause immensely. Edzard had free access to all the schools in the city, and through his loving and gentle instructions the children's hearts were easily won, and many youthful disciples gained for the Lord. Thus the fact may be accounted for, that a larger number of converts was made by him than by any other individual labourer of the Evangelical Church.

The man who, before all others, claims attention by the zeal and hopefulness with which he advocated the cause of Israel in the 17th century, was Spener. It may be said of him that he was the first to put mission work among them on a proper basis. The principles and rules laid down by him for the successful proclamation of the gospel, are worthy of careful study even in the present more advanced age of missionary enterprise. He was not entirely free, however, from the great error of the Church in his time, that the task of converting Jews to Christianity was the proper work of the civil power. But he earnestly disclaimed every idea of force or penal measures being adopted towards them. All must be done in a spirit of love, the only motive power that can be appealed to or recognised in the kingdom of Christ. Only the State is bound, he thinks, to aid the Jew in finding a trade which shall leave him less exposed to temptations to fraud or cunning, than the hawking and usury which alone were open to him in that age. Since the greatest of all hindrances to the conversion of Jews is the unholy walk and conversation of professing Christians, there is room at this point also for the intervention of the civil arm to punish vice and encourage virtue at the same time. The chief means to be employed to gain Jewish hearts are the Scriptures and the preaching of the gospel. Preachers he counsels to be prudent in their choice

of subjects, as well as in their method of argument. They should not begin with what may be termed the mysteries of religion, but rather with those historical references in the Old Testament, which most plainly find their fulfilment in the New. A suitable theme *e. g.* would be the harmony between the teachings of Moses and the doctrine of Christ, or the presence in Jesus of Nazareth of all the signs of Messiahship looked for and predicted by the ancient prophets. Care should be taken to hedge catechumens and proselytes about with every safeguard against temptation and backsliding which Christian love and watchfulness can supply. Above all, the prayers of the Church should be frequently offered for the Divine preservation of converted Israelites in the paths of faith and Christian patience. These rules, and many others of a similar character, are well worthy the careful study of all who would labour in the Hebrew vineyard. Spener's own life was moulded in accordance with them; and no Jew could come in contact with him without feeling how purely and fervently the fire of love for Israel burned within his breast.

Zinzendorf was filled with the same ideas regarding the message of the Gospel to the Jews as Spener. But he differed from him in one important point, the nature of which will be most clearly seen from his own words. In an address to the Jews in 1740, we find the following remarkable utterance:

"From the beginning ye were always disposed to oppose the truth. Your own prophets testify against you. Moses calls you a stiff-necked people. Thus, when ye should have worshipped the One God, ye desired many gods; ye were told He was invisible, and ye desired to see Him; ye are told He has revealed Himself in three Persons, and ye insist on His Unity. We tell you He has been seen of men, and straightway ye reply that no one can see Him. Ye went up to your high places instead of His Temple: now, when He may be worshipped everywhere, ye insist on having your own separate holy places."

Whilst, therefore, he was prepared to preach the Gospel to all heathen nations, Zinzendorf was unwilling to tell those whom he addressed as, "My fathers, whom I revere for your fathers' sake," the story of the cross, until they should abandon their self-righteousness and, becoming little children, come of their own accord to learn. This feeling, however, was not shared by his followers. The pious Leonhard Döber, for example, on his return from St Thomas about 1738, devoted himself without any reserve to missionary work among the

Jews of Amsterdam. He took up his residence in the Hebrew quarter, the so-called Jöden-hock, where he lived in great poverty, but labouring earnestly in his noble vocation. The fruits of his labours were few, however, until Samuel Lieberkühn, himself a proselyte, came to his aid. The latter soon gained, through his extensive knowledge of Hebrew literature, an entrance into circles that had remained obstinately closed against his less scholarly colleague. Gradually Lieberkühn came to exercise an extraordinary influence over the entire Jewish population of Amsterdam. They called him their "dear Rabbi Samuel," and for years after his death held his memory in affectionate veneration as a man who "loved their people." He was the means of bringing many converts to the Christian fold.

Space does not permit us to refer to all the eminent proselytes who in this age passed over to the Christian ranks. Among them we find names famous in the annals both of Church and State. One feature common to all of them, and at the first glance somewhat startling, is the fact that their conversion cannot, we believe, in a single case be traced to the direct missionary efforts of the Church, but was produced by private study or by accidental intercourse with pious scholars. In some very notable instances it resulted, though indirectly, from the curious influence exercised by the romantic school over the most cultivated intellects of Germany. We shall glance briefly but at two cases representative of an entire class, which includes such names as Neumann, Christfels, Christhold, Gottlob, Heilbrun, Lichtenberg, Lichtenfeld, Gottfried, Stahl, Rubino, and Phillipsborn. We select as examples Augusti and the celebrated historian Neander.

Friedrich Albrecht Augusti[1] was born in Frankfort in the year 1691. His Jewish name was Josua ben Abraham Eschel (Herschel). His father, originally a goldsmith of Venice, had been driven by persecution from his native place, and settled in the old German city. The son received a careful education, and from his earliest years evinced such extraordinary talents that high expectations were cherished by the Frankfort Synagogue of his future career. But the sudden death of his father, leaving his family unprovided for, seemed to cross these

[1] Compare the short but admirable biography of this extraordinary man, published by the Niedersächsischen Tractat-Gesellschaft, Hamburg.

hopes. His mother being unable to support him, he was sent, whilst still a mere child, to the care of a rich uncle in Lithuania. Here he made the acquaintance of a distinguished Rabbi who had just returned from Jerusalem, and who spoke only Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Arabic. In an incredibly short time the youth learned to converse in these languages, and having thus attracted the notice of the learned traveller, became his pupil, and under his direction began to study the Talmud. Soon he became thoroughly conversant with all the traditions of his fathers; and, his imagination fired by the stories of his teacher regarding the wonders of his fatherland, he resolved to make a journey to the East and see with his own eyes scenes famous in Hebrew history. He set out on his travels, but when passing through the Crimea was taken prisoner by a band of Tartar robbers, who sold him into slavery. From the effects of what he endured in the slave ship which conveyed him to Constantinople, his constitution never recovered. In the slave mart of that city he was purchased by a wealthy renegade from the Jewish faith, who carried him to Smyrna. At length some rich Jewish merchants, moved with compassion by the sufferings of the delicate youth, ransomed him, and supplied him with means to return home. He seems to have had some thoughts about this time of embracing Christianity; but the priests to whom he applied for instruction were men whose ignorance and evil ways soon inspired the pure-minded earnest Hebrew with disgust for the faith they professed but did not practise. He journeyed to Cracow, where, as subsequently also at Prague, he applied himself with untiring zeal to the study of Hebrew theology. His great attainments soon attracted general notice, and led to a proposal from the Rabbinical College of Cracow, that he should proceed to Italy, at their expense, to study the Kabbala, with a view to his becoming a Rabbi when he should have attained the legal age. This proposal he accepted; but shortly afterwards, when on the way to Rome, circumstances induced him to change his purpose and settle in Sondershausen. Here he became librarian to a wealthy citizen called Wallich, who treated him with the utmost consideration, and in whose house he enjoyed the society and friendship of many distinguished scholars, whose hearts he won by his dignified demeanour and learned discourse. On one occasion thieves broke into the house, and

Augusti, in defending his patron's property, was savagely beaten and left for dead on the floor of the library. Soon after his recovery a trivial incident led him to the study of Christianity. His friend was one of the class known as "Court Jews," *i.e.* Jewish bankers and men of business attached to the residences of German princes. On the death of his sovereign, Prince Christian, Wallich presented his new patron, Prince Gunther, with an address of congratulation on his accession. In the course of his remarks he alluded to his Highness's sainted predecessor. Gunther abruptly stopped him with the question how it came that he, as a Jew, could thus speak of a Christian, seeing that in Jewish eyes all Christians are lost for ever when they die? Wallich appealed to his librarian as one better able to answer the question than himself. Forthwith the young scholar was sent for, and in the presence of the prince and the bishop of Sondershausen demonstrated that the Jews regarded all pious Gentiles who kept the seven laws of Noah as the saints of Jehovah. The learning he displayed on this occasion gained for Augusti the friendship of Bishop Reinhard, whose pious conversation and genial Christianity soon made a deep impression on the Jew. He began to study the ancient prophets, especially Isaiah, in the light of Reinhard's criticism, and soon came to recognise the Messiah of his people in Jesus of Nazareth. He resolved to make a public profession of his new faith, and carried out his purpose in the synagogue on the 22d May 1722. The scene on that occasion is described as one of inexpressible solemnity. When he finished making his declaration before the assembled Rabbis, Reinhard arose and conjured him in the name of Jehovah to weigh well the step he was taking before it should be irrevocable. It was not yet too late to retreat. Only on the ground of the strongest convictions of the truth of Christianity would he be justified in abandoning Judaism. But Augusti's answer was clear and final: "He believed with his whole heart that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God, the Messiah, who should redeem Israel." He was proof against the entreaties of his weeping friends, and left the synagogue with Reinhard, rejoicing that he had found the Lord. After some months spent in meditation upon the doctrines of Christianity, and in spiritual conversation with his friend, he was baptised on Christmas day 1722. He afterwards studied Christian theology for a

short time at Leipzig before being appointed pastor of Eschenberg, in the Duchy of Saxe-Gotha, where he laboured for forty-five years till his death, in 1782, at the ripe age of ninety-one. His son, who succeeded him in his pastorate, made an oration at his funeral from a text selected by the old man on his death-bed—Isaiah liii. 4—the same passage that years before had been the means of flooding his mind with the light of Gospel truth. The bitter enmity displayed towards him by his former brethren is characteristic of the change which had passed over the relation of the Synagogue to the Church. Christendom had began to manifest a spirit of love towards the House of Israel, and by the force of this new weapon was gaining at all points upon Judaism, and gathering its best and noblest spirits into the ranks of the Church. Hence the bitter enmity on the part of the more extreme zealots who held fast to their faith. On one occasion an attempt was even made upon Augusti's life by means of a pamphlet, sent him through an unknown hand, the leaves of which had been impregnated with a deadly poison. The odour penetrated to his brain, but fortunately the plot was detected in time to avert a fatal result.

The case of Neander properly falls within the nineteenth century, but we refer to him here inasmuch as he is a representative of the class under review. The biography of this extraordinary man who, next to Schleiermacher, has been more instrumental than any other in stemming the tide of rationalism, has yet to be written. But men are still living, in high places in the academic world of Germany, toiling in Lutheran parishes, in not a few instances filling high offices in the service of the State, whose eyes still moisten and whose lips quiver when they speak of their departed master, of his loving gentle ways, of his childlike simple habits, of his strong faith in the Saviour he loved. When the story of his life comes to be written, that will not be its least interesting chapter which tells how he moulded by his teachings the ecclesiastical service of his country, by sending forth from his class-room to fill the pulpits of Germany, a generation of preachers who differ from their predecessors of the old dead orthodox period in being strangely in earnest about the *person* of the Son of God. Though dead, the old Jewish-Christian doctor yet speaketh, and teacheth powerfully in the Christian

churches. Let us glance briefly at the leading facts of his history.

His Jewish name was David Mendel, and his mother was a relative of Mendelssohn, the philosopher.[1] His parents resided in Göttingen, where the historian was born, on the 17th January 1789. Soon after his birth, his mother separated from her husband, and settled in Hamburg, which city Neander always spoke of as his native place. The extreme poverty of his mother seemed to preclude all hope of a liberal education, when accident procured for young Mendel the notice of Perthes. The great bookseller observed the Jewish lad one day gazing with hungry eyes at the books exposed in his shop window, and, entering into conversation with him, soon detected his rare abilities. He determined to befriend him, and actually undertook the cost of the youth's education in the Hamburg Johaneum, then under the management of Director Gurlitt. His teacher soon recognised the vast range of the boy's intellect, and spared no pains to call forth his latent genius. His attendance in the Johaneum began in 1803, and in April 1805 he was ready to enter the university. He took leave of his school life in an oration on the theme, "De Judaeis optima conditione in civitatem recipiendis." He began to study jurisprudence, but in reading Plato felt so deeply moved in spirit, that he forthwith resolved to examine the evidences of Christianity in the light of philosophy. His mind never lost the impressions it received at this time; and some of his most celebrated works are unmistakably marked with the Platonic impress. The work which the Greek philosopher had begun, Schleiermacher was to finish. Those wonderful *Reden* which marked the beginning of a new epoch in the religious life of Germany, and dealt the first vigorous stroke to the upas tree of rationalism, that baneful product of the dead orthodox age, proved in Neander's case, as in thousands of others, the golden key to open to his mind and heart the meaning of the Great Mystery. The pietistic influences emanating from Halle were utterly powerless against the daring, though in most cases earnest, rationalism of the age. Certainly a mind like Neander's could never have been touched by them. But his spirit found its fellow and true

[1] Compare Uhlhorn's Biographical Sketch, Herzog, x. p. 235; also the Works of Krabbe, Kling, and Hagenbach, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1851. III.

exponent in the bold speculative genius of Schleiermacher. Christian philosophy completed what Platonism had begun, and the youthful Hebrew believed with his whole heart that Jesus is the Christ. It is worthy of note that, during the time of his searching after the truth, whilst still a student of jurisprudence in the Hamburg Gymnasium, he enjoyed the intimate acquaintance of such men as Sieveking, Neumann, Noodt, Varnhagen, Matthias Claudius, and Adalbert von Chamisso. With these friends he formed a club, whose symbol was the North Star,[1] and it was probably their influence that induced him to make public profession of Christianity. He was baptized by Pastor Bossau, in the church of St Catharine, in Hamburg, on the 25th of February 1806, and forthwith exchanged his legal studies for theology. He visited the University of Göttingen, where he derived much benefit from the lectures of Planck. A chance conversation with Professor Frick, whose acquaintance he made in his uncle Stieglitz's house, in Hanover in 1807, first opened his eyes to the fact that his teacher Schleiermacher, whom, however, he regarded till the day of his death as his spiritual father, was not infallible. He laid his hitherto philosophic guides aside, and began to study the New Testament alone. Soon he advanced far beyond his teachers in spiritual wisdom. He preached his first sermon in Wandsbeck, from the text John i. 1. On coming down from the pulpit, Claudius embraced him, and wept tears of joy over him. But he had convinced himself that the pulpit was not his vocation, and resolved to devote himself to ecclesiastical history. After refusing several offers from other places, he accepted a professorate in Heidelberg, where he introduced himself to the University in 1811, by a dissertation: "De fidei gnoseosque Christianae idea et ea, qua ad se invicem atque ad philosophiam referantur, ratione secundum mentem Clementis Alexandrini." But Berlin, and not Heidelberg, was to be Neander's home and the scene of his great life labours. Just as the University of Berlin is inseparably bound up in its history with the rise of Prussia from the ashes of those desolating fires which France had kindled over Europe, so also the members of the theological faculty of that university were before all

[1] Many of Neander's letters, as also Chamisso's, are signed with the initials τ. τ. φ. α., *i. e.* τὸ τοῦ φίλου ἄστρον. Compare Herzog, x. p. 236.

others the main agents and leaders in the great theological *renaissance* still going on, and in that Christian regeneration of Germany which has hitherto kept pace with the political elevation of the empire. Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Neander were the three mightiest among the new reformers. The latter settled in the capital, and in 1813 began those great works which have made his name famous throughout the world.

Our space does not permit us to follow the course of his laborious and fruitful life in its details. It is beyond our province to criticise, or even to enumerate, the works that emanated in rapid succession from his teeming pen. It is enough to observe, that from first to last, all his writings bear the impress of the great theory with which his mind was filled regarding the history of the Church. For Neander, the story of the method and events of God's government of His kingdom was one grand epic, though having many parts. He saw in it the record of the gradual leavening of the life of man with the life of God, the story of the life of Christ inscribed in the book of humanity, the narrative of a divine-human principle emanating from the Saviour, and gradually pervading and re-moulding the human race. "History," says he, "enables us to recognise how a little leaven cast into the lump of humanity is gradually leavening the mass." Half a century later, Richard Rothe has applied the same theory to ethical, and partially also to political, science, which Neander applied to ecclesiastical history.

His influence over the students, as indeed over all with whom he came in contact, was extraordinary. His personal qualities gained for him not only the respect, but also the love, of all who knew him. The mildness of his judgments procured for his theological views access into circles which would have remained obstinately closed against the harshness of a polemic. His favourite motto among his students and friends was, "Pectus est quod facit theologum;" and this saying characterises his entire life and labours.

He was carried off by dysentery on the 14th of July 1850. His end was peaceful and easy, like a child falling into slumber. After taking leave of his students and friends, who stood weeping round his bed, his last words were, "I am tired, and must sleep; good night,"—and calmly, as to sleep, like flowers

at sundown, his spirit swept through the mysterious gate that swings between earth and heaven. Dr Strauss of Berlin made an oration at his burial, from the text, "That disciple whom Jesus loved said unto Peter, It is the Lord," and more suitable words could not have been chosen to sum up the life and character and labours of the dead. Whilst Schleiermacher undoubtedly ranks higher as a Christian philosopher, and was beyond all question the first to enter the lists successfully against rationalism and begin the regeneration of Christian theology and life in Germany at the beginning of this century, yet, so far as regards the personal and practical influence of the two men during their lives, and their memories when dead, the chief place must be assigned to Neander the Jew.

JOHN C. MOORE.

---

## ART. III.—*Dr Charles Hodge and the Princeton School.*

IT is very rarely that any one holds a professorship for fifty years. Even on this account the celebration, two years ago, of Dr Hodge's professorial jubilee, was a somewhat notable event. It was all the more notable because the venerable divine was manifestly in the full vigour of his faculties:—witness the publication, then in progress, of his great work on Systematic Theology; witness also the preparation since then of a work, now published, on Darwinism. But it was most notable because of the extraordinary enthusiasm that characterised the celebration. The whole Presbyterian Church of the United States, of which Dr Hodge is the acknowledged Nestor, was manifestly moved to its deepest heart. The New England Congregationalists were really not behind their Presbyterian brethren. American Episcopacy was represented by warmly sympathetic addresses from the venerable Bishops MacIlvaine and Johns, who had been fellow-students with Dr Hodge in youth, and, notwithstanding some vigorous controversy about points of difference, have been his warm friends through life. And, to say no more about American Evangelism, the celebration was characterised by congratulatory addresses from all the principals and professors of the Free Church of Scotland, as well as from

professors of theology in the other Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and Ireland. The attitude assumed towards Dr Hodge by all who thus addressed him was one of affectionate respect, such as few men have ever gained from the great Evangelical empire which they represent. The undertone of their utterances was that he is a true and great man, theologian, Christian,—yea, that in some respects he is the great divine of English-speaking Christendom. Dr M'Cosh went further than this, speaking of Cunningham and Hodge as the two greatest divines of Christendom in our time; and this statement was at least in the line of the other utterances we have referred to.

We believe that the lamented Cunningham regarded Dr Hodge as really the greatest living theologian in Christendom, and that Dr Hodge has held Cunningham in the same estimation. This may have been the generous exaggeration of men who in the noblest sense were rivals, and who both were characterised in high degree by the heroism of modesty, without any taint of *falsetto* self-depreciation.

Of the first two volumes of Hodge's "Systematic Theology" a somewhat elaborate notice has already appeared in this *Review*. The third volume, completing the work, is now in the hands of the public. Of this volume we will only say here that it bears the same general characters which that notice pointed out in the previous two volumes. The work as a whole has been sufficiently characterised in our pages; and we shall not now go into any further criticism of it, except so far as it may give us illustrations of the main subject of our present observations.

In the present article we shall speak, somewhat freely and discursively, of Dr Hodge himself, regarded as the representative man of what is now well known as Princeton theology.

The Princeton Seminary has been singularly favoured in respect of teachers. During the two generations of its existence it has been presided over by the two truly noble families of the Alexanders and the Hodges, along with other individuals, such as Dr Dod, of first-class intellectual and spiritual power. Though the first president was the excellent Dr Miller, the first professor was Dr Archibald Alexander, and Dr A. Alexander must be regarded as the founder of the school. It

is difficult for general readers to understand how he came to be so profoundly venerated as he is by a man so great as Dr Hodge. But readers of his Life, by his son Dr James Waddell Alexander, can see this. His long life is one of the most beautiful and noble lives in ecclesiastical biography. For twenty years he was a successful minister in the true sense, and (as he ever continued to be) a preacher of pronounced individuality and extraordinary power. All this time he was a keen student of theology in all its departments. After these twenty years he was set apart by the American Presbyterian Church to the office of theological professor in Princeton. There, while Dr Miller reigned, Dr Alexander really governed, for forty years. Beginning with a class of three students, he ended with leaving Princeton Seminary the most important theological institute in America, and with making the name of Princeton synonymous with one of the most important theological schools of opinion in the world. The reason of this is that, with great intellectual power and ever-growing amplitude of learning, he was not only a sincere and humble and energetically fervent Christian, but a really great man, with transcendent administrative capacity—one of those men who are born to become true fathers of churches and nations.

In thus speaking of Dr Alexander, we are not led away from Dr Hodge. The two men are only two parts of one whole,—a whole represented by the name of Princeton theology. Dr Hodge would resent as a personal injury the suggestion that he has been anything apart from Dr Alexander. Dr Alexander, on the other hand, while always regarding Dr Hodge as a beloved son, very early began to look up to this son of his as theologically the father of Princeton. The spirit of his regard to him is represented by an utterance of Dr James W. Alexander, in connection with the "Princeton Review," to the effect that Dr Hodge, in relation to fundamental questions, prescribed the constitution, while the other Princeton people carried out the Hodge-given constitution into detailed applications. This view was formally taken by the elder Alexander. A far different view has been given by Dr Hodge. The reciprocal relations of the two were singularly beautiful. We might set the matter thus:—Alexander was the Socrates of the Princeton School, and Hodge has proved to be its Plato (?) and Aristotle. The two between them have

been the leading power in eliciting a school of Christian thought which, more and more manifestly, is destined to be the dominant thought of Christian America.

Looking back over the history and progress of this really illustrious school, one is struck with the great value of individuals and families. Alexander's professorial career, extending down to 1851, overlapped Dr Hodge's during about thirty years. Dr Alexander had as colleagues his two sons, Drs James Waddell and Joseph Addison. Dr Hodge has as colleagues also two sons, one in Princeton, and one in Pennsylvania. It is hardly too much to say that these two noble families may be regarded as equivalent to the Princeton School. Notwithstanding the eminent gifts of the younger Alexanders, their father must be regarded as theologically the head of the family. And if we were to choose between the two, Dr Hodge is probably more fully entitled than even the elder Alexander to be regarded as Princeton's leading representative man.

Such discussions regarding the comparative value of families and individuals would probably be offensive to the persons in question; for, from the early professorial days of Drs Alexander and Miller downwards, the Princeton School appear to have with singular brightness and beauty obeyed the precept, "In honour preferring one another." It may therefore be best to contemplate the two families together, as parts of one whole. And in this combination they present a very memorable illustration of the value of individuals and families. For the two families of the Alexanders and Hodges have, within the last two generations, been the leading agencies, under God, in giving to the great empire of New America a theological back-bone. As an illustration of contrast, we need only refer to the family of the Beechers, male and female. Notwithstanding their great intellectual power, and social and political enthusiasm, and warm religious feeling, it would be severe irony to say of this family that they have materially contributed towards the formation of a theological back-bone for the American States.

The Princeton School is inseparably associated with the "Princeton Review;" and the "Princeton Review" means mainly Dr Hodge. The present writer has got from the Rev. Mr Gibson of Perth a reading of the recently published volume

of Indexes to that Review, including a general preface, and giving biographical information regarding the Reviewers. In this volume we get information, so far as attainable, regarding the authorship of articles in the Review. The value of this information is evidenced by the circumstance that a famous article on "A Nation's Right to Worship God," which has been recently reprinted in Scotland as an article of Dr Hodge's, is ascribed in this volume to a different author. The prefatory narrative in the volume passes over Dr Hodge's name with a coldness which would have appeared insulting, if the reader had not, long before reaching the end of the narrative, divined that the author of the narrative is Dr Hodge himself. No one else in the United States could have spoken with that apparently insulting coldness. Every one would have spoken about Dr Hodge, in relation to the Review, with warmth, with passion, either of hate or of love. For by common consent in America the Review is Dr Hodge. He first set it on foot as the "Biblical Repertory," containing translations from foreign tongues of important utterances regarding all that is included in the idea of Biblical theology, specially in relation to Biblical criticism. In a very few years the "Biblical Repertory" became the "Princeton Review." Under this new title the periodical launched boldly out into the whole question of the contents of Christian revelation, and of the relation of these to all human thought and life.

We have not the opportunity of looking back over the whole series of the Review. We can recal to mind only the numbers issued in somewhat recent years, along with the republications, in two large volumes of "Princeton Essays" (A.D. 1846), and (A.D. 1857) in one volume of "Essays and Reviews" by Dr Hodge. We may, however, divine with some confidence the general character of the publication, not only from the samples we have read, but also from the very valuable volume of Indexes, with its interesting sketches of the history of the movement represented by Princeton and its Review. From the means of judging within reach of us, we conclude that the "Princeton Review" must to a large extent consist of matter permanently valuable, so that one could with real profit read it straight through from beginning to end.

This character of the Review, as consisting of material mainly permanent in value, is by no means a thing of course.

In Germany, the *Studien und Kritiken* has had a history somewhat similar to that of the "Princeton Review." During the forty years (1827–1867) between its origin and the death of its originator, Dr Ullmann, the German periodical took a leading part in the restoration of belief in Germany—at least among theologians. But, in the first place, that Review never had the place of decisive importance in Germany which the Princeton has had in America. And, in the second place, as now appears, the German periodical has not had, in nearly equal measure with the American, the character of permanent value. Its very first article, by Ullmann, now swollen into a volume, on "The Sinlessness of Jesus," was again and again reconstructed by the esteemed author before it had assumed its present final form,—a form which, even now, is in respect of doctrine not definitive, but really tentative and crude. We believe that Dr Lindsay Alexander had some years ago in view to produce two volumes from the *Studien* which might occupy some such place as the "Princeton Essays." We have no doubt that there might be produced from the *Studien* a number of articles whose value is imperishable. A selection, even where the value is perishable in relation to dogmatic or biblical theology, might be permanently valuable as illustrating the history of the German movement—among theologians—towards completed restoration of faith. But, almost from the nature of the case, the mass of the articles are individually of perishable value. For what they represent is a *transition* state of thought and knowledge; so that the utterance of to-day, in advance of yesterday, is antiquated to-morrow.

This *transition* character of certain utterances, and their consequent perishableness of value, is illustrated in America by theologians of the Beecher style—we cannot speak of a Beecher *school*. Sensational utterances of men in a transition state of mind, whether the movement be upward or downward, such utterances make for the moment an impression more lively than that made, ordinarily, by utterances of definitive ascertainment; as a fish, flashing momentarily out of the water, impresses (for the moment) the eye more than it is impressed by a star shining quietly in the sky. Still, the flashing emergence of a fish out of water is forgotten after a moment;

while a star shining in the sky continues to shine quietly on "for ever and ever."

The reason why the Princeton utterances are thus permanently valuable is manifestly this,—that they represent, wholesale and retail, the matter of Christian thought sytematically apprehended, under law to a well-defined conception of Christianity which, as long experience has shewn, is not transitional, but abiding. The Princeton school has been markedly biblical in its thinking. Dr Archibald Alexander was all his life-long an enthusiast in biblical studies, specially in relation to hermeneutics and criticism. His son, Joseph Addison, author of the learned commentaries on Isaiah and the Psalms, who was reckoned a prodigy of linguistic erudition, devoted his whole life to the study and exposition of Scripture. The "Princeton Review" was, as we have said, at first for some years a "Biblical Repertory" of articles directly devoted to expiscation of questions regarding Holy Writ. Dr Hodge, the now acknowledged *Coryphæus* of the school, had been twenty years professor of Biblical Theology before he became professor of Systematic Theology. The influence of this biblical culture appears not only in his production of commentaries on the Romans and the Corinthians, through the former of which he first became well known in this country; it appears also in his occasional expressions (which receive a peculiar force of significance from what now is known regarding his life's history of sacred thought), to the effect that the theological opinion of true Christians—though conforming to this or that school—is not inherited from any school of the past time, but is daily being formed by reverential study of the Bible; and it appears perhaps most clearly and fully of all in his great work now completed on Systematic Theology.

This truly great work is abundantly systematic and scholastic. Perhaps it is superabundantly so. We might have liked it better if it had conformed more to the type of Calvin and the great divines of the sixteenth century, and less to the type of Francis Turrettine and the great divines of the seventeenth century. Besides, the scholasticism, even *a la* Turrettine, is sometimes overdone. In reading the work, we sometimes have the impression that the division and subdivision is excessive; that it does not represent a really logical process of thought, marshalling all species under a well-defined

genus; but that rather it represents the manifold *jottings* which an active-minded man may have made for class-purposes, without always taking pains to bring them all under one clearly conceived head of exposition. In respect of logical coherence and movement, the work appears to us to be at some points markedly behind the author's occasional essays, such as those republished in his volume of "Essays and Reviews." Again, the work is here and there strenuously metaphysical. This must be in the case of any man of real and great intellectual power speculating about Christianity. There are some detailed facts and doctrines of Christian revelation which constitute, so to speak, the *physica* of that revelation. In relation even to these there are questions of principle which fall to be regarded as concerning the *metaphysica* of that revelation. Further, the revelation overlaps, so to speak, the revelation of nature, so as to become implicated with questions regarding natural metaphysics about "God, freedom, and immortality." Dr Hodge, as a true and great theologian, is thus occasionally metaphysical in his great work. We must confess that, in the distinctively metaphysical portions of his work, he appears to us to be comparatively feeble,—to be, like Jonathan Edwards and Sir William Hamilton, a great reasoner rather than a great thinker. Once more, Dr Hodge goes into purely scientific questions regarding nature. We wish he had not interwoven his views regarding questions of physical science into his great work. The fact—*e.g.*—of *his* having in that work decisively opposed evolutionism, is fitted to produce the mistaken impression that opposition to evolutionism is indispensable in order to completeness of theological orthodoxy; whereas, in truth, evolutionism has little or nothing of theological significancy: supposing evolutionism—that, to a theologian, would mean only *mediate* creation as distinguished from *immediate* creation. Still, while thus decidedly, and sometimes unhappily, scholastic, metaphysical, and scientific, Dr Hodge's great work is fundamentally biblical. Every reader sees that what the author mainly asks himself is, "What saith the Scripture?" And this is characteristic of his school.

The circumstance that the Princeton school is thus emphatically biblical is very auspicious for Christendom. For it means that one of the most powerful empires of Christendom

is probably destined to be determined in its theological thinking by the authority of God's Word. We rejoice in this. And yet we rejoice in the fact that the utterances of the Princeton school have been very distinctively dogmatic or systematic, having reference most emphatically to the *contents* of Christian revelation, as distinguished from the mere form and record of that revelation. In other words, we regard with great joy the fact that it is the characteristic thought and utterance of Princeton which has culminated in the Systematic Theology of Dr Hodge.

It is possible to be occupied in a small sporadic way with the form and record of Christian revelation without any real practical regard to the substance or contents of it. Such occupation about form, to the exclusion of matter, is always frivolous, and in relation to Christianity is really profane. The Princeton school, therefore, have done a real and great service to the Christian world by shewing main regard to the contents of revelation, while at the same time shewing a keen regard to all questions affecting the form and record of the revelation.

Their predominant regard to the contents of revelation has appeared in various relations. In relation, for instance, to slavery and the civil war, the Reviewers have spoken with decision and force. In relation to the whole subject of "A Nation's Right to Worship God" (their own happy expression for nationalism in religion), they have taken a part which will perhaps be incomprehensible in this country to the advocates of a vulgar Voluntaryism which means (unconscious ?) individualism to the exclusion of nationalism. They took a leading part in the great controversy which resulted in the separation of Old School from New School American Presbyterianism in 1837, and have taken part in those discussions which ended in the recent reunion of the Old School and the New.

In relation to this class of, so to speak, administrative questions regarding the applications of Christian truth or law, the *manner* of the Princeton school has been characteristic. Controversy is perhaps not a good test of Christian character. The proverbial *odium theologicum* may be really creditable to theologians as a class, because evincing the glowing earnestness of their convictions. That glowing earnestness sometimes brings about a state of mind which might be represented by this formula: "If any man do not accept my opinion, then he is, not a blockhead, but a fiend; and it is my Christian

duty, not to refute him, but to destroy him." We therefore must not rashly assume that a man is not truly Christian in his ordinary life if he should be extremely unchristian in controversy. Still, we cannot close our eyes to the fact, that controversy brings about surprising revelations of natural character. Some men, heretofore supposed to be simply saints, will betray a frailness in the fibre of their manhood; either by unmanly sulking or whimpering if they be on the losing side, or, if they be on the winning side, by indulging in cowardly insults to adversaries, sometimes sinking to the saucy impertinence of a "gentleman's gentleman." Other men will evince a firm fibre of manhood; either by sweet uncomplaining acceptance of defeat, so far as they are personally concerned, or by magnanimous forbearance and kindness towards those over whom they have got the upper hand. They will shew themselves, when tested, above the "flunkey" nature at both its poles—as felt by Paul the magnanimous—of servility on the one hand and insolence on the other. This greatness of nature has been exhibited in remarkable measure from first to last by the Princeton school in general, and by Dr Hodge in particular. They have in their controversies been earnest, eloquent, warm, even passionate; but, so far as we know, they have invariably spoken as true Christian gentlemen, who in relation to adversaries make due allowance for the fact that—speaking *more Americano*—"there's a great deal of human nature in man." They have shewn themselves to be manly men, of the heroic type.

The firm fibre of manhood characteristic of the Princeton divines has been manifested not only in the spirit of their utterances as a whole, but also in the very matter of those detailed utterances to which we have now referred. While contending for emancipation, they refused to accept the Abolitionist dogma, that bond-service in all cases involves scandalous sin. While maintaining the right of the American United States to prevent secession by force of arms, they maintained that the Northern Church had no right, in Christian law, to brand all secessionists as "rebels," in the sense of scandalous sinners. While heading the theological polemic against New School opinions, they discountenanced and condemned that ecclesiastical action of the Old School party which occasioned the separation of 1837. And though they have

at last acquiesced in reunion, this, as they themselves remind us in their preface to the Index volume, was not until they had got a public declaration which warranted them in believing that the (once) New School Presbyterians are now really and fully at one with the Old School in holding the complete Calvinism of the Westminster Confession. This conviction must be very grateful to them; for, being of this conviction, they must regard the reunion as a new triumph, most honourable to both parties, of that doctrinal system from which the New School at one time had seriously deviated, and for which Princeton and the Old School have all along persistently and powerfully contended. But the point at present is, that all through those controversies, from the time when Dr A. Alexander set himself against the hyper-Calvinism of Emmons, the Princeton school have acted with a blended moderation and force which implies true manly strength and wisdom, and which, existing in such high degree in a school so influential, is an element of great beneficent capabilities for the American churches and nation.

At the heart of the whole Princeton movement there has from the outset been the exposition and defence of the Calvinistic system of doctrine, as definitively elaborated in its main outlines by the great "Reformed" divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Recognising faith as the appropriate root of all rational life, the school have all along proceeded on the assumption that a complete coherent Scriptural system of doctrine is the greatest gift which Christian teachers can confer on the Churches. They have from the outset maintained that the one only complete coherent Scriptural system of doctrine is the Calvinism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They therefore have always ostentatiously disclaimed the pretension of being a school in the sense of having any peculiar doctrine of their own. At the recent jubilee celebration, Dr Hodge declared, and the declaration is cited with approbation in the Index volume, that not one original idea has ever emanated from Princeton. The expression "original" here was perhaps not very happily chosen; for the best and truest originality consists in looking at a matter with one's own eyes and speaking of it with one's own words, and this originality has characterised the Princeton school in very high degree. But what the patriarch manifestly meant is, that Princeton

has never pretended to novelty of doctrine, but has always been so persuaded of the substantial accuracy and completeness of the old system as to regard mere novelty with suspicion and dislike,—from the view-point of Tertullian's famous *præscriptio*. And this description of the school is unquestionably accurate: it is simply a generalised statement of the plain facts of its history. Dr Hodge himself is in no way strait-laced in adherence to details of that system. He rejects, for instance, the favourite Calvinistic doctrine of *concursus*, not because he thinks it untrue, but because he thinks it incompetent, as not being revealed in Scripture. In disowning the validity of Romish baptism, on the ground that the Romish Church is not in any relevant sense a branch of the Christian Church, he and Dr Thornwell have mainly led the Presbyterian Churches of the United States into a position which has been repudiated as unchristian and sectarian by the generality—we might employ a far stronger expression—of Reformation Churches. Nevertheless the school has from its beginning been characterised by rigorous adherence to what may be designated Old School Calvinism of doctrine.

This has been to the school a great strategic advantage. In relation to mere tactics of momentary debate it may be advantageous to conceal some offensive features of a system, or to adopt no system, but to restrict one's self to offensive criticism of a system, or to energetic advocacy of atomistic plausibilities. But this tactic, which may result in winning a battle, is ruinous in a campaign. For true and great strategy it is necessary to advocate a system, and to present its offensive features from the outset. Now the Calvinism of the Princeton school is a system, complete and coherent. Besides, it represents a *permanent*, as distinguished from transitional, mode of theological thinking: so long as the world stands, and men are seriously occupied with theological speculation, the strongest men will, as a class, be Augustinians or Calvinists. For some sort of Determinism, as represented *e.g.* by the "ideas" of Plato and the fatalism of the Stoics, is seen by deeply thoughtful men to be a commonplace fact of ordinary world history; and, we believe, the distinctive Determinism of Augustine and Calvin—determination of human destiny by divine freewill—is a plain fact of Scripture revelation and Christian experience. The Princeton divines, therefore, in accepting the complete Calvinistic system, have been right in

point of strategics, were it only because the position they thus have assumed will, notwithstanding its obvious difficulties, continue to be a most commanding position—the most commanding position—through all generations.

It would be a gross mistake to suppose that the Princeton school have simply shewn a dogged determination in favour of that system. They have evinced splendid qualifications for true original research, such that their adherence to the system is a most powerful new evidence in its favour. We have already referred to their wide and deep biblical culture. We shall now refer, in passing, to a historical and philosophical culture which is, perhaps, not much less important. Dr A. Alexander, besides being a keen student of metaphysical speculations, was devotedly given to theological readings of every sort: for instance, he not only had once read the Church Fathers, but periodically revised them. As to Dr Hodge, his breadth of information is really wonderful. He is equally at home among the fathers, the mediæval schoolmen, the "old dogmatists" of the Reformation epoch, and the Continental theologians of our new time. The American Church was wise in sending him, before he had begun his properly professorial career, to Continental Europe for two or three years. One result has been a true and deep philosophical culture, without which a man can hardly aim at being a theologian. No reader of the "Systematic Theology" can fail to see, almost on every page, that the revered author is a contemporary of all ages, and a master of all relevant systems.

In addition to this general training, theological and philosophical, the Princeton school have undergone a discipline of true life of thought in America. We have referred to the circumstance that Dr A. Alexander was in early life exercised by the hypercalvinism of those who maintained, *e.g.*, that a man ought to be willing to be damned. The Princeton school have had to deal, besides, with a considerable arrear of loose theological thinking, resulting from some characteristic utterances of "New England" congregationalism. More recently they had to deal with a really infidel transcendentalism, associated with the great name of Coleridge, but really meaning Socinian apostacy from Christian faith. Most recently, they did battle for thoroughgoing Calvinism of the Old School against a "New School" which now has happily ceased to be in profession. It is hardly worth while, in this relation, to

mention that the Princeton school have been called to deal with merely scientific heresies, regarding the nature of man and the constitution of the universe. Apart from this, it is abundantly clear that they have been providentially so placed as to necessitate real thought on their part regarding all the main matters of Christian revelation; so that their deliberate judgment is an important new testimony in favour of the faith once delivered to the saints. And it is an incalculable advantage that their learned thought is not mere speculation, but the systematic apprehension of a Christian faith which is energetically moving great masses of the people. Princeton theology is not, like some German theologies, a thing merely of the cloister. It is the scientific expression and vindication of a veritable faith in the heart of a nation; so that if Princeton and its history were this day obliterated from history and memory, some equivalent for Princeton would have to-morrow sprung up in the forsaken place. And this, we repeat, is, in point of Christian strategics, an incalculable advantage to a theological movement; for it means that the Christian nation is ready as a reserve force for the army now in the field.

The American Presbyterian Church must surely have been specially under guidance of God in setting up the Princeton Seminary. With all due affectionate regard to American Baptists, Methodists, and other non-Presbyterian denominations, we cannot conceal our conviction that Presbyterianism, with its admirable combination of flexibility with strength, is the only system of church government likely to take permanent possession for Christ of what may prove to be the most powerful empire in Christendom. In England, at the time of the Restoration of Charles II. (A.D. 1660), there was a very noble Presbyterian Church. But that Church, before the end of last century, had dwindled to the dimensions of a few Socinian chapels. Such an event is all but impossible in America. And the all but impossibility is in some measure owing to the Princeton school.

The present writer has shrunk from expressing fully his feelings in relation to Dr Hodge, mainly because, though this great man is personally unknown to him, he could not fully express his feelings without appearing guilty of extravagant adulation, a meanness which would be vehemently offensive to Dr Hodge, especially if perpetrated in honour of himself.

JAMES MACGREGOR.

## ART. IV.—*Recent Roman Catholic Literature in France.*

*Rome et le Vrai. Etudes sur la littérature Catholique Contemporaine.* Par FELIX BUNGENER. Paris. MICHEL LEVY. 1873.

THIS work of M. Bungener is not controversial, but a critical study of the popular Roman Catholic literature of the day, which is expected to do so much in renovating France. The style is calm and luminous; and the appreciation given of the writers of liberal Catholicism is very unbiassed. Of late years the works of these writers, most of which have been translated into English, have been much read and admired even by Protestants. They are well calculated, by a certain vague and mystic sentimentalism, to work upon the feelings of seriously disposed but ignorant minds, who value emotion above instruction. It is to this class that M. Bungener addresses himself.

The principal works reviewed and commented upon are Joseph de Maistre's works; "The Life of Ozanam," by the Abbé Perreyve; Abbé Gratry's works; Mdme. Swetchine's "Letters;" "The Lives of Maurice and Eugènie Guérin;" "A Sister's Story," &c. In all this literature what strikes M. Bungener most forcibly, is a certain absence of truthfulness —that is, of absolute or perfect sincerity. He detects running through it an inflation of style, as if the writer felt that he must needs throw dust in his own and in his reader's eyes. He says:

"We see here true sentiment almost always gliding into false. Sometimes the style is bombastic; sometimes, on the contrary, there is an exaggeration of the artless, the sweet, the tender. Then, side by side with these tendernesses and their sonorous magniloquence, for the smallest possible reason are found sarcasms, anathemas, often as little truthful as the rest—that is to say, quite out of proportion to the cause which provoked them." "These writings," continues M. Bungener, "address themselves to all classes of persons. To sceptics is presented the pillow of submission, not to a religion, but to a system; to the young and imaginative, a romance filled with highflown sentiment and vagueness. Our modern writers have attempted to reach some by a certain philosophic religiosity, others by that hazy piety in which faith becomes what it can."

The Church of Rome has often been rudely handled in polemical treatises, but this charge of insincerity is a blow

calculated to strike deeper; for whom do we find thus sacrificing to tradition or sectarian prejudice, forgetting the noble oaths they had taken on the altar of truth? A Joseph de Maistre, a Lammenais, a Lacordaire, a Montalembert, a Gratry!

Our author does not satisfy himself with taking isolated cases, but proves that on almost every subject—such as the Bible, liberty, faith, Jesus Christ, grief for the dead, the miraculous, the saints, Mary, the priesthood, confession, the Pope, history, or the Church—the teaching of Rome is uncertain and fluctuating, determined by circumstances. Take for instance *the Bible*, and see what Rome makes of it. She proclaims loudly that it is the Word of God, sacred and infallible, yet she treads it unscrupulously under foot. Paganism, though it did not acknowledge an infallible authority, was not so insincere as this. The oracle was its authority, and we never hear of the priest teaching the neophyte the art of eluding the commands of the god as the Romish priest in the seminary does in regard to the "oracles of the living God." Joseph de Maistre does not mince the matter: "If a society were being established" (this was written in 1818, at the time of the formation of the Bible Society) "to buy up and burn all the Bibles in the vulgar tongue, I should be very much tempted to join it." Such language from the fiery Ultramontane is in perfect harmony with that of Pius IX., who, in 1854, called the Bible "poisoned food," and in 1864, the Bible Society "a pestilential invention." But how does this agree with the pages where Ozanam dwells upon the earnest care of Cassiodorus and the venerable Bede to spread the Word of God, or with this declaration of M. Nicolas in his "Art of Believing": "We ought not to subject the Bible to our spirit, but to submit ourselves to its spirit; humility and faith alone have a right to open the seven seals, as we read in the Apocalypse." Nothing better could be said than this; but what is the result of these contradictions? It is this, that the influence of the Bible is almost null in the piety of Romanists, and still more so in their literature. "I have read very little of the Bible," writes Albert de la Férronays, and, adds M. Bungener, "he almost seems to congratulate himself upon it." Eugènie Guérin does not appear to know more about it; she hardly ever quotes from it, and never very exactly, and when she does, it is only a few of

the most universally known passages. "Some allusions here and there to the circumstances of Christ's passion, but nothing of His discourses, far less of the apostolical epistles. I do not think she names St Paul once." On the other hand, she reads daily the legend of the Saint of the day, admiring everything, and trying to believe everything, which is less easy but more meritorious! Among her desires in behalf of her brother, who had become a sceptic, she says: "If I could insinuate into you what I am learning in books of piety, these beautiful reflections of the Gospel!" The Gospel alone has never sufficed to feed Roman Catholic piety. It requires something less sober—something more marvellous. Paul, John, or Peter does not excite the imagination like St Francis preaching to the fishes, or Cupertin suspended between heaven and earth!

It is sad to see the Abbé Gratry, the brilliant author of "The Knowledge of God," "The Knowledge of the Soul," and the "Treatise upon Logic," works of real value to the thinker, losing himself in the obscurities, puerilities, and false interpretations of the schoolmen. The same pen which wrote two valuable volumes on "The Ethics of the Law of History," has written a "Month of Mary," in which we read:

"'When two or three are gathered together in My name,' said Jesus, 'there am I in the midst of them,' which being interpreted signifies: 'The will of God is that all souls should be one. The union of the grains in the ear expresses but imperfectly the union of souls in the heavenly city. But what is this city if it be not thee, O Virgin of Virgins! with thy Son in thine arms.'"

Thus Jesus becomes once more a little child, and it is His mother who is present in the midst of souls, while the child cries: "Mother, who nursed, suckled, and brought Me up, cause Me also to grow up in souls, form and develop Me in them."

Mdme. Swetchine[1] writes to Lacordaire to ask how it is

[1] Count Tolstaï has called Mdme. Swetchine the head of the Ultramontane party in France. She certainly was the connecting link between Rome and the aristocracy over whom she held sway—"Her Ultramontanism was not narrow, for the simple reason," adds the Count, "that narrow Ultramontanism would not have suited Parisian society. She attenuated its intolerance. She made it partaker in the most recent conquests of science as well as in the glory of the arts; in a word, she covered it with the coating best suited to the taste of her contemporaries, but all her efforts were directed to one end—*i.e.* to do the work of the propaganda—a refined, imperceptible, seductive propaganda."

that the gospel for the day of the Assumption of the Virgin contains no allusion to the Virgin? Lacordaire does not seem to have answered this ticklish question; at least the answer has not been found. However, she answers herself by supposing that there must be some deep teaching in this apparent inadvertence of the Church. We are rather inclined to think with M. Bungener that this depth is a depth of subtlety: "As it was impossible to find in the Scriptures any trace of the imaginary *fête* solemnly celebrated on the 15th of August, it is clear that it was found better to pick out a portion of the gospel where the Virgin is not mentioned at all rather than run the risk of leading people to inquire why the Assumption is not mentioned where she is spoken of."

*Liberty*, like Revelation, is received by Rome with open arms, except where she can suppress it. How can this be when a whole class of writers exist who go on repeating, "The really free man is the Roman Catholic"? The word *delirium* applied by the Pope to all sorts of liberty is not delirium then! Lacordaire, preaching in favour of modern liberty under the arches of Notre Dame at Paris, is not then in contradiction with Lacordaire going to Rome in 1850 to sacrifice it at the feet of the Pope, declaring that he recognises in the Church the power which has been conferred upon her by Jesus Christ, not only to correct her rebellious children, but to constrain and compel them by salutary punishments. And again, that there is no abuse of authority when the Church exacts by force what depends upon the heart and persuasion! How then can he return and preach at Notre Dame the same liberty he has been denying at Rome? It is the old story—"truth on this side of the mountain, error beyond them." The whole secret lies in knowing how to *define*. Pascal said to *distinguish*, but Father Felix likes the word *define* better:

> "It is something remarkable," says he, "that the institution which perpetuates the life of the world and the functions of God upon earth, has always had a passion for *defining*. *Definition* is the word with which it gains the great battles of doctrine against all errors. . . . The truth says: *Here I am* . . . and the battle is won, and error slain for ever in the mind."

Surely in regard to *Faith*, the teaching of the Church which represents itself as the infallible guide of souls, must be clear. But no; it is here in particular that sincere and longing souls

who ask for bread are offered a stone. The only object presented to the inquirer is the Church. What is the Bible without the Church? "A book, the butt of all the contradictions of critics, a heap of sand swept by all the winds of the times." When Renan's "Life of Jesus" appeared, in what camp was the panic? Serious Roman Catholics saw that it was useless to oppose the authority of the Church to Renan; but where were they to seek their weapons? Rome might anathematise, but could not answer. It was those who were wielding the "sword of the Spirit" who came forward at this juncture, with perfect confidence in that Word of which Rome would fain deprive them.

The life of Maurice Guérin, as it is related by his sister, is a touching example of how little Rome can do for a suffering, burdened soul. Every line reveals suffering, but not one word of consolation. In June 1835 he writes:

"I understand less and less of the end of life, and what is to be done in it. Oh gate, instituted to combat grief through strength, thou hast only combatted life through death, and we are not more advanced than thou art!"

Poor Maurice! Neither Lammenais, nor nature, nor the mass, brought him comfort; and yet, because he changed his views on his death-bed, he is transformed into one of the heroes of modern Romanism! His sister even seems to forget the story written in tears by his own hand, and tries to persuade herself that his literary fame (which she greatly overrates) comes from the Church. The Romanist faith, even in the Church, is not a very positive or assured faith.

"Suppose," says our author, "a man to whom Christianity is entirely unknown, reading the lives of those persons (such as the two Guérins), what will he find? Ardent aspirations after another life, after heaven, but at the same time such regrets given to departed relatives and friends that he will ask himself whether they really believe in that heaven and that life."

This want of a positive faith must strike every Protestant who reads the inscriptions on the tombs in a Roman Catholic cemetery: "Eternal regrets," "Unceasing tears," "He was ravished too soon from the arms of those to whom he was so dear,"—such are the usual epitaphs accompanied by the cheerless *R.I.P.* We have at times felt as if a pagan cemetery could not be more dark or more utterly devoid of hope in immortality and the resurrection, in spite of the pardons and plenary indulgences profusely suspended over the graves.

We all know only too well how, little by little, Rome has substituted the worship of the Mother for that of the Son. But we are accustomed to think of this superstition, which Joseph de Maistre, in his imperturbable frankness, calls "the outworks of the citadel," as chiefly confined to the ignorant and uneducated masses. Not so; a professor of the Sorbonne, the Abbé Perreyve,[1] thus salutes Mary as "queen of the sciences, queen of theology":

"How should she not occupy the first place in the science of God, she who approaches and touches God by so many wondrous titles?—daughter, spouse, mother of God. Queen also of Philosophy; an admirable harmony of all the faculties has made her soul the masterpiece of intellect and reason. Queen of Jurisprudence, &c.—Queen of History. . . . . The bond of all truths; the centre of the questions concerning God and history."

After this there can be no place for a Redeemer except *pro formâ*. Even then, Jesus is little more than a martyr who has entered heaven in common with all the saints, in virtue of His sufferings. Even Eugènie Guérin seems to forget that Jesus has not merely *entered*, but *re-entered* heaven: "If God send us trials, it is to make us like Christ, who *entered* heaven only through His sufferings." The truth is, modern Romanists are so taken up with saints and mediators of all kinds, that Jesus is to them, in Bungener's words,

"like Epicurus' God, they do not know in what part of the universe to find a suitable occupation for Him. On earth He is replaced by the Pope; between earth and heaven by the Virgin and the saints, as the channels of grace; in heaven, still by the Virgin and the saints, to whom almost all prayers are addressed; and thus, having neither to intercede nor to save, He cannot be the active living Head whom true Christians need to *know* and to *see* by their side in all the combats of life."

Even transubstantiation, which has been invented in order to render Him more present to the senses, turns to the Virgin's profit. Gratry speaks of the believer who is nourished by the sacrament in these terms:—"This believer into whom thou comest, O Mary, when Christ gives us His blood, His flesh, and His divinity. . . . ." Thus there is a double presence! Nor is this in any sense a spiritual presence, it is purely and simply local. How else are we to explain the grief of Mdme.

[1] "Another of those noble minds," says M. Bungener, "who aspired to break the trammels, and who is in a fair way to be surrounded with a halo which his modesty would have led him to reject."

Swetchine at being obliged to leave her beautiful chapel in her hotel at Paris?

"Do you know what it is for me to be obliged to separate from my chapel? Do you know that God, your God, our Saviour and our Father, is present day and night in it in His adorable humanity? Do you know that since the day He entered it He has never left it? Can you feel what is passing within me, in the depths of my soul, on account of this cruel, this heartrending separation?"

We seem to hear again the bitter cry of Mary of Magdala: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." This longing soul certainly feels the want of a Saviour who is not in the wafer; but she seems to believe Him to be so exclusively there that she cannot find Him in any church from which the wafer is banished.

"At sight of the empty tabernacle, it seems as if all around were struck with sterility and annihilation. The solitude of the desert extends over the whole sacred enclosure, the life has retired from it."

Such is Rome's last word in so far as the Lord Jesus Christ is concerned; we see what a local pagan divinity she has made of Him.[1]

In the course of his book, M. Bungener analyses particularly the work entitled "A Sister's Story," which, it will generally be allowed, is the best of its kind. Here, too, as in the others, he detects diplomatic cunning, high flown and conventional rhetoric, and a false or hollow tone which betray the absence of personal conviction and inward sincerity. He illustrates this state, which is neither hypocrisy nor faith, by a series of examples and citations.[2] We heartily concur in the following

[1] M. Taxile Delord, in his "History of the Second Empire," speaking of the clergy from 1863 to 1867, thus expresses himself: "In proclaiming the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, in order to give an idea of its strength, the Church appeared in a manner to wish to substitute the worship of the Mother of the Saviour for that of her divine Son. The Virgin changed her physiognomy; she was no longer the austere Virgin of the middle ages, nor the Madonna of the Renaissance smiling to the Child, but the Queen of heaven and earth. Her arm, made to wield the sceptre, gave up the divine Child to St Joseph, who was brought forward to the front of the scene. The Father and the Son were thrown into the background. Every morning the newspapers announced the erection of some new statue, now at Puy, now at Marseilles; every town, every village, was to have its own one. The Virgin alone wrought miracles. In substituting the worship of a woman for that of a Man, the Church seems to say that men are breaking away from it, and that it is over women and by women that it expects henceforward to reign."

[2] *Correspondance du Journal de Genève*, 15 Juin, 1873.

words, only wishing that those of whom he speaks would read his book before committing themselves to those seducing forms which are beguiling so many "unstable souls":

"The history of Alexandrine is that of many persons. . . . Ignorance of doctrine, the need of forms, the influence of human affections and of afflictions, have rendered them docile; and these are the veins worked by all those authors who have written to help forward this movement. Albert is a type offered to young men, Alexandrine to young girls and young married women; Albert and Alexandrine to husbands and wives. . . . The snare into which the superficial Alexandrine fell is one which a great part of Roman Catholic literature has since been spreading, we shall not say before Protestants, who are generally better forearmed, but before all those superficial and floating minds, whom there are hopes of enrolling under the Ultramontane banner. . . . This giving up of one's self into the hands of the physician can never bring recovery or strength. This insipid piety may resemble faith, but it is not faith. This system of morals may produce some good works, a certain languishing sanctification, but not *men*, in the virile and Christian sense, nor *women*, in the sense at once amiable and strong which sober Christianity alone can give to this word."

C. DE FAYE.

---

## ART. V.—*The Revival in Scotland.*

IT is certainly not beyond the mark to say, that in point of extent, power, and wide-spreading influence, the religious movement of the last six months is unprecedented in the history of Scotland. We mean that never, within the same space of time, has so large a harvest been gathered into the Christian garner. We have but slender materials from which to judge of the more spiritual aspects of the work at the Reformation; but what we have lead us to believe that conversions, in the more profound sense of the term, were quiet and gradual rather than rapid and simultaneous. There are some interesting notices, indeed, of the brief ministry of George Wishart, that would lead us to class him with revival preachers; nothing could be more interesting than the scene near the Kirk of Mauchline, when, prevented from entering the church,

he stood upon a dyke outside, and for three hours preached to the multitude with such melting power, that among others Laurence Rankin, Laird of Sheill, one of the wickedest men in the country-side, fairly broke down, and, with streaming eyes, gave himself to Christ. His preaching at Dundee, too, during the prevalence of the plague, seems to have been greatly and immediately blessed. The infected or suspected stood on one side of the gate, and the whole on the other; and from the text, "He sent His Word, and healed them," the preacher pressed the message of salvation with wonderful power alike on the living and the dying. Many ministries in the end of the sixteenth century were attended with eminent blessing,—such as that of Robert Bruce of Kinnaird, and that of John Welch; but simultaneous outbursts of religious interest seem as yet hardly to have occurred.

In the seventeenth century, however, the phenomenon became more marked. Livingstone at the Kirk of Shotts, David Dickson at Irvine, Robert Blair, and others, were connected with rapid and extensive spiritual movements; and "the Stewarton sickness" denoted a singular work, half-spiritual, half-physical, that spread like an epidemic along the banks of a single stream. Yet no operation of a few months during all that century affected so large a number of persons as the awakening of the present year. In the eighteenth century there was a nearer approach to this movement in the great awakening at Cambuslang, Kilsyth, and other places; and as George Whitefield pursued his meteor-like course, there was something like a Pentecostal ingathering; yet, in connection with Whitefield's work in Edinburgh, singularly successful though it was, the number that seemed to get saving good was reckoned at but a few hundreds. Some of the awakenings in the Highlands at the beginning, or in the course of the present century, seem to have been very wonderful, both for extent and depth of impression; but, being in places so out of the way, and among a people so peculiar, their influence on the rest of the community was comparatively slight. Such vast and numerous evangelistic meetings as have been held in Edinburgh and Glasgow during the current season; such streams of stricken ones asking the way to Zion; such gatherings of young men, consecrating themselves to the Lord; such crowds of children singing their

Gospel hymns with the fresh interest and happy trust of children, and honestly trying to avouch the Lord to be their God; such regiments of Christian recruits entering Christ's army overflowing with zeal and love in His service, and all within the brief space of half a year, no previous age has witnessed in Scotland.

It is a fact worth noticing, that as soon as controversy ceased this work began. The painful degeneration, in its latter stages, of the Union movement, especially in the Free Church, after such an auspicious beginning and hopeful progress, was a humiliating event. To many minds it suggested very painful thoughts as to the facility with which the spirit of alienation and bitterness, with all the reckless projects which it breeds, may take the place of brotherly confidence and love. All men of the quieter type were greatly distressed to see so much of passion and energy, time and treasure, given to a comparatively insignificant controversy, while, in comparison, the great work of the Gospel was carried on tamely and feebly. Many an earnest prayer rose to heaven that the zeal and fervour might be turned into a better channel; and these prayers were not long of being answered. While the din of unbrotherly strife prevailed, God's Spirit seemed afar off. When brotherly love began to reassert its claims, the Spirit began to work. The same thing was observed in previous revivals. The awakening at Cambuslang and its neighbourhood took place about the time when the first Seceders left the Established Church; and it is noticed in Gillies' Collections, that those who were much implicated in the controversies connected with that event did not receive a share of the blessing. But, even apart from controversy, there was hardly a minister or layman who did not wonder a year ago that the faithful preaching of the Gospel from so many pulpits, and the diligent prosecution of Sunday schools, Bible classes, and other forms of pastoral activity, were not attended with more success. In spite of all, it could not be denied that several members of Christian families were forsaking the old paths and choosing the world, and that hardly any conversions were taking place from the ranks of the world to the Church. It was with no small anguish that the prayer was wrung from many godly hearts, "Return, O Lord, and visit Thy vine and the vineyard which Thy right hand hath planted." The eyes of His people were turning

most wistfully to God; and with a Pentecostal suddenness there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind.

It is in every way a most difficult thing to estimate spiritual results, more especially in the case of a movement only a few months old. But even the characteristic caution of Scotchmen does not hesitate to acknowledge with thankfulness undeniable tokens of remarkable blessing. Christian parents thank God for touching the hearts of their children and turning them to the Lord; ministers of the gospel say that they never spent so happy a winter, and never had such pleasure in admitting young communicants, the number of whom has often been quadrupled, while their spirit has been all that could be wished; professors of divinity tell what a quickening has been enjoyed by their students, and how much the young men have been blessed in their evangelistic work; and Christian teachers talk of marvellous waves of blessing rolling over their schools and classes, and pre-eminently of the singular impression that has been made on the Training College of the Free Church in Edinburgh, where the two hundred normal students, male and female, seem all to have been impressed, and most of them converted. In Glasgow the work has been on a larger scale than in Edinburgh, especially among young men. Such a result as seventy young men in Glasgow and thirty in Edinburgh declaring themselves willing for foreign service in the Church of Christ, speaks volumes for the movement. The class among whom the work has chiefly gone on, are those who have been well brought up,—the children of Christian parents, mainly in the middle walks of life. In many cases apt to be counted as conversions, the saving impression had probably been made before; but the change from timid discipleship to bold decision, and from unconscious to conscious grace, has been so great that the subjects of it have been disposed to think that only now they have begun truly to live.

It is quite possible to give to Mr Moody and Mr Sankey the fullest and heartiest acknowledgments of invaluable service, and yet to hold that the causes of revival lay much deeper than with them or their visit. The truth is, that in many parts of Scotland where they have never been, there has been a work of grace more extensive in proportion to the population than in any place which they have visited. In the heart of Aberdeenshire, with the secluded parish of Drumblade as a centre,

and embracing half-a-dozen contiguous parishes, where the population is very scattered and purely agricultural, a work has been going on which is believed to have added to the church of the σωζομένοι not less than a thousand souls. In Sunderland, on which the visit of the Americans produced but little impression, a glorious harvest has been subsequently gathered in by a handful of divinity students and others. What, then, has been the service of Moody and Sankey? Great it unquestionably has been, and to them as instruments in God's hands the commencement of the work and the kindling of the flame which has spread so widely must always be ascribed. When they came to Edinburgh, there were thousands of lamps trimmed and ready for lighting; only they remained unlit. The ministers somehow had not skill to apply the torch, or they kept waving it round and round the wick in the hope that it would take fire, instead of bringing it right into contact with it. They seemed not to be very sure whether the wick was capable of being lit, or whether the torch was capable of lighting it. In their prayers, too, there was much of the same indirectness and uncertainty. And in singing, it seemed to be thought enough to let off superficial and easy feelings. Song did not seem to be the vehicle for the profounder emotions of the soul. When the strangers came, all this was changed. Mr Moody's preaching was the directest, simplest, homeliest that can be conceived. His prayers were equally simple, homely, and business-like. An intense sense of reality was gendered by both. Evidently he had an intense conviction that the Gospel was God's instrument for drawing men to Himself, and that, when asked in Christ's name, His divine power was present to make that instrument effectual. The lamps were capable of being lit, and the Gospel torch, under the silent power of the Spirit, was capable of lighting them. Instead, therefore, of waving the torch round the wicks, he brought it right down upon them, crushing them sometimes, you might almost think, by his urgency, but certainly lighting them. He claimed nothing peculiar to himself in the success vouchsafed to his method; all preachers and speakers who would do the same would be equally successful. Besides the more direct good he has done, Mr Moody has been of eminent service in brightening the faith of the Church in these two things—the efficacy of prayer for God's blessing, and the efficacy of the Gospel

message when preached "in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance."

In regard to the character of the fruit that has resulted from this work, the general testimony is, that it is just like the ordinary fruit of a successful ministry, only more abundant and of richer quality. If a Christian minister were to bring together all the best cases that have occurred in his ministry within a period of twelve or fifteen years, they would form a tolerably correct counterpart of the results during the present period of awakening. It is a revival without many of the common accompaniments of a revival. As some one has expressed it, it is ordinary work with extraordinary power. The singular quietness and orderliness with which it has gone on have struck every one. There has been no sensationalism, no undue excitement, no prostrations, no screaming, no fondness for late meetings, no waiting till two in the morning for the illapse of the Spirit, no hysterics, and no ecstatics. Neither has there been any tendency to separation or anti-churchism. On the contrary, some of the ministers who have been most engaged in the work say that separatists have been coming to them and joining their churches. Though Mr Moody claims for himself the liberty of working for Christ as a volunteer, or member of the irregular ministry, he fully and cordially concedes the necessity of a regular ministry and an organised Church. Neither has this movement revolved round any secondary truths or matters of opinion, elevated into vital questions. It has not been associated with any question about baptism, or the time of the second advent, or the metaphysical definition of faith. It has been based on the broadest of Bible truths—the great Gospel message—the way of life—the atonement of Christ, and the mission of the Holy Spirit. Mr Moody, however, has gone, unconsciously it may be, on a principle of the late Dr Duncan's—that every man should have a large creed for himself, and a small one for other people. He has encouraged greatly the study of the Bible. He has urged his inquirers and converts to study it systematically, and try to come to clear and sound conclusions on every topic of which it treats. He has tried to bring them into closer relations than before with their ministers, and by engaging them in earnest work for their Master, and teaching them to grapple with the necessities of souls, has guarded them

against the worship of crotchets, and against all unwholesome developments of spiritual earnestness.

If our view be correct, that this movement has been one of ordinary work with extraordinary power, it will go far to solve one of the most important problems in connection with the progress of Christianity. Hitherto, at least in a great many instances, there has been a contrast between revivals and the ordinary operations of the ministry. To many minds, the idea of a revival is connected with artificial excitements, loose theology, fanatical wildness, disregard of church order, and neglect of church ordinances. No doubt this idea has received some justification from revivals got up at camp meetings, or otherwise, where there has been little or no teaching of God's truth, but simply a vehement endeavour to excite the feelings, and, by mere pressure, induce the undecided to declare for Christ. At the same time it is true, on the other hand, that many revivals have been much more like the ordinary operations of the Church, quickened and intensified. What we remark of the present movement is, that more than any which has preceded it in this country, at least in our time, it bears this character. It is revival without revivalism. Fourteen or fifteen years ago, when the last considerable movement of the kind occurred in this country, the subject was embarrassed by questionable accompaniments—physical prostrations and excitements, which were especially common in Ireland, and tendencies in some quarters to Plymouthism and erroneous teaching. Any approval of that movement was always qualified in the judgment of the sober-minded by considerable abatements; and to those to whom these abatements were specially obnoxious, the whole thing presented a repulsive aspect. If we have now got revival without artificial excitement, if the ordinary means of grace have received new power, if persons who know the truth have been urged and enabled to decide for Christ without illegitimate pressure, if the vital force of the Church has been increased without the introduction of any countervailing weakness, it is evident that we have got a most important result. For every thoughtful man admits that, under the ordinary ministry, there is a liability to tameness in dealing with souls, and that occasionally an extraordinary appeal is greatly to be desired. Men who preach from week to week, feeling that they will probably have the same chance with their hearers for an indefinite

period, cannot be expected to be so direct and urgent as those who come for one brief night, or one brief week, and who feel that if they are to do any saving good, it must be "now or never." If we have now learned to combine revival power with pastoral diligence, and to make evangelistic fervour give a new and healthy action to the ordinary forces of the ministry, we have reached a position of great importance in connection with the spread of Christian life.

Ere we proceed further, one feature of the present movement may demand a moment's consideration, as furnishing an apparent exception to what we have said of it as exemplifying the fruit of ordinary work with extraordinary power. We refer to that part of the agency which is supplied by Mr Sankey. In adverting to this, we place entirely out of account the circumstance of Mr Sankey making use of an American organ. A very ridiculous importance has been attached to that circumstance in some quarters. At the recent meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, the Rev. Mr Makennal went so far as to say, that in this movement there was a *triad* of agency—Moody, Sankey, and the organ. The statement was as wide of the truth as it was unhappy in form. Mr Sankey uses the organ merely to rest his voice, and it is simply ridiculous to ascribe to it any other or higher share in the service which he conducts. The true peculiarity of his method is expressed in the somewhat abrupt and naked phrase—singing the Gospel. His object is, to present the truths of the Gospel in musical tones, and lend to them whatever additional force and persuasiveness musical sound can convey. Is this an innovation? Perhaps it is, in our ordinary service. Yet surely the principle of it is at least as old as the days of David, and in New Testament times it is as old as the angel's song. Psalms and hymns are of two kinds—devotional and didactic. Why do we ever sing didactic songs? Beyond doubt that by singing them we may give to the truths which they embody a richer and more powerful expression. Singing tones are fitted to convey more of feeling than speaking tones, and are therefore a suitable vehicle for didactic songs intended to move feeling as well as intellect. If singing of this kind forms no part of our ordinary service, the sooner it began to do so the better. From its very nature, Mr Sankey's method of solo singing is unsuitable for public worship, and the fact that but

few men are endowed with a voice capable of singing as he sings, is a proof that in any public assembly such singing can only be exceptional and occasional. But surely it is time that those who conduct our psalmody were learning to make it a vehicle of deep and earnest feeling. It is time that they were learning to fill their own hearts with the truths expressed in our sacred songs—learning to pray over them, and to entreat that as they utter them, the Spirit of God would use them for impressing those in whose hearing they are uttered. Why should singing be performed more carelessly than either preaching or praying? Why should it be thought that good and well-trained voices are the only requisite for precentors and choirs, and that spiritual experience is of no moment here? We seem to be on the eve of learning two great lessons—the spiritual power of sacred song under the action of the Holy Spirit, and the need of the same exercises of preparation and prayer for the singer as for the preacher, in order that the souls of both may be filled with the truths which are to be spoken by the one and sung by the other.[1]

If there be truth in our theory, that the special value of the present revival consists in the unusual degree in which it harmonizes the ordinary and the extraordinary methods, it

[1] The wonderful popularity of Mr Sankey's hymns is quite a phenomenon. Their popularity in Scotland is the more remarkable, that hitherto hymns have never taken a very deep hold of the Scottish mind. In one short half-year a set of hymns and tunes have sprung to a place which even the songs of Burns hardly reached in their palmiest days. You hear them in drawing-rooms, in workshops, in dressmakers'-rooms, in Sunday schools, and at prayer meetings; you hear them hummed by the thoughtless *gamin*, and accompanied with the concertina by the itinerant street-singer; the fisherman in his boat, the ploughman in the field, the mother lulling her infant, all resort to them; north and south, east and west, nothing is so popular as Sankey's hymns. Apart from its religious significance, this is a remarkable phenomenon in an intellectual and social point of view. There must be a remarkable power in any set of songs that acquire so wide and so sudden a popularity. Nothing can be more silly or absurd than the way in which such papers as the *Saturday Review* treat a movement presenting such features as this. In a literary and scientific point of view, such writers astonish us. It is humiliating to think that members of the literary fraternity can satisfy themselves with the merest drivel in accounting for a movement which has exercised an unprecedented influence in so many quarters. They ascribe it to what they call "comic religion." Comic religion! as if any quantity of the comic could move men's hearts as they have been moved by "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by," or by "Safe in the arms of Jesus."

follows that great care ought to be taken to maintain this harmony, and not to allow the one to overlay or supersede the other.

There are two risks to which the pastor is liable. Either he may judge that his ordinary pastoral methods are sufficient without the assistance of the revivalist; or, finding how much the revivalist is blessed, he may deem it the best course for him to follow in his footsteps, and continually reiterate the same truths to his people.

Both risks need to be guarded against. The revivalist and the pastor are the complements of each other, and the wisdom of each is to supply the elements in which the other is deficient. In reference to the first risk, it is natural enough for a sober-minded, steady-going pastor, to turn with aversion from the revivalist, because he is so unlike to himself. But the thoughtful and conscientious pastor will feel that, just because he is unlike to himself, there is the more need for his help; the vigorous, clinching appeals of the revivalist being fitted to supply the very element which is most awanting in the pastor's method of presenting truth.

The other risk comes after a revival. The pastor is tempted to think that urgent invitations to sinners to come to Christ is the only class of topics with which his discourses can warrantably be occupied. We readily allow that, during the prevalence of a living interest in the way of life, and while not a few are obviously hungering and thirsting after righteousness, the offer of the Gospel should be the constant topic; but in due time other topics must be introduced, otherwise an air of feebleness and monotony will be given to the whole ministrations.

The policy of the revivalist is like the policy of Napoleon—to concentrate his attack on a single point. He aims at entering the soul at a single avenue, and he presses in until, by God's blessing, his end is gained. Let us suppose that the avenue in question is that of the feelings. The revivalist preaches the love of Christ, and presses it so strongly that at last, through God's grace, the barrier is broken, and the soul is subdued by the sense of that great love. Suppose now that the pastor, following in the footsteps of the revivalist, should continually press the feelings with this one truth; in such a case there will be produced the evil that flows from constant appeals

to a single faculty. The duty of the pastor is to enter by each of that round of avenues by which a man's soul may be approached. Reason, conscience, the will, the feelings, the imagination—he must appeal to all. He must endeavour to rouse and exercise all, otherwise there is produced a stunted and one-sided religious life. If one special view of grace has been urged by the revivalist, the pastor has the more need to bring forth in due time and in the proper order the complemental truths that are needed to complete the view. The *freeness* of grace is the aspect on which the revivalist is most apt to dwell. Lest a perverted view of this freeness should be taken, let the pastor dwell in addition on the *fruitfulness* of grace. If the one has been at pains to clear away good works from the foundation laid in Zion, let the other be careful to shew how they come in again as the fruit and evidence of a genuine faith. It is of the utmost importance that the pastor should see that reason and conscience are not left to lag behind the feelings and the imagination. It is so much easier to minister to the latter than to the former, that wherever the current teaching is hastily prepared, this result is almost sure to follow.[1] The people will have ill-balanced minds and ill-regulated consciences. The duties of common life will be regarded as hardly lying within the boundaries of the kingdom of Christ; the temper will be unguarded and the tongue unwatched, and serious detriment will begin to come from the notion that the spiritual region is so much higher than the moral, that slips in the latter ought not to be thought much of, when great regard is had to the former. No result more disastrous can follow a revival than when the conscience lags behind, and no object of a subsidiary kind should engage more earnestly the pastor's attention than to keep conscience abreast of all the other faculties.

All the more necessary will it be to take much pains in training the conscience, if it be true that the absence of deep conviction of sin is in many cases characteristic of the present movement. What the old divines used to call "law work," does not appear to have been a conspicuous feature of the

[1] One of the most important lessons from the older Scottish revivals bears on the value of ample scriptural instruction. Our forefathers concentrated their efforts on this, and with great success. Full, clear views of divine truth are the indispensable basis of a permanent spiritual life.

revival. In some former revivals, and particularly in Highland districts, there was much more of this, and in the view of those accustomed to it, the present movement is viewed with some suspicion as approaching to the slight method of healing the sinner's hurt, saying "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. In point of fact, however, in some of the most marked cases of conversion in the New Testament, a prolonged law-work had no place. And it seems to be the method of the Spirit in many cases to rectify the conscience after conversion, by bringing it more gradually to a sense of sin, and a perception of the need of entire conformity to the will of God. In the case, therefore, of those who have not been very much exercised with a sense of sin before conversion, there is all the greater need for careful training of the conscience afterwards. The neglect of this is apt to give rise to very perplexing and distressing instances of backsliding, more especially when, in the previous condition, the moral texture has been somewhat loosely compacted. Nothing is more to be dreaded than a susceptibility of emotional impression in union with torpidity of conscience. It is from this source that the greatest scandals have come upon revival-religion, and that all revival operations have been liable to distrust on the part of those with whom moral integrity is the backbone of all goodness, and who can hardly comprehend, far less excuse, any laxity there.

Another most important duty of the pastor after a revival, is to direct into proper channels the Christian activities that have been evoked in the course of the movement. Wherever the movement is earnest and hearty, these activities find spontaneously a certain scope for themselves. When the Gospel comes to any one, "not in word, but in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance," there arises an irresistible disposition, at least for a time, to try to influence companions and acquaintances, and get them to share the blessing. But the careful and deliberate training of this disposition is one of the most important practical duties of a revival. That which is an impulse must be formed into a habit; that which springs from feeling must be attached to conscience, in order that the due state of things may be attained. The impulse will otherwise pass away, and the whole movement come to a standstill. And here, as it seems to us, appears to have been a great want in the working out of earlier revival movements. So far

as we can see, there was little attempt at the great Cambuslang revival, for example, to get converts trained to occupy themselves systematically and constantly in doing good to others. One of the great wants of that age was the want of the missionary spirit. It is almost incredible how little the best writers of the eighteenth century recognised it, or tried to supply it. You may read volumes of Boston and the Erskines without any mention of the heathen, at home or abroad. It seems to us that at present there is no question of more pressing importance than that which concerns the training of converts to the work of the Lord. It is the want of this that has made revival movements so fitful, and has given rise to a popular impression, that in the nature of things, a revival must be followed by a reaction, and that in a few years you will find that the average amount of spiritual life has not been exceeded, through greater langour succeeding the period of greater activity. We hold that this is not the right or normal state of things. There is no good reason why revivals should not be chronic. If our view be correct, that the present movement exemplifies ordinary work with extraordinary power, there is no good reason why it should not be a permanent state of things. The efforts of earnest ministers should be specially turned in this direction. The training of converts to work for their Master is one of the most important duties that can engage their attention, and it is well worth the while of Churches to consider whether a minister might not be spared from ordinary pastoral work in some of our large towns, to superintend this training of converts. The ordinary duties of the ministry are so heavy, that without the sacrifice of some of them, it is hardly possible for a hard-working minister to give much time to a new department. An active, earnest minister, with a faculty of organising, if set apart to the work, might be extremely useful, and might so simplify arrangements that it would be comparatively easy for the mass of the clergy to give it the attention which it requires in detail.

In these remarks we have in view the case of converts remaining in secular pursuits, but trying, at the same time, to do some work for the Lord. But there is another class of converts whose case demands more special attention. We refer to those who deem it a duty to give up all secular work, and in some capacity or other devote themselves wholly to

Christian service. Two methods of doing so may present themselves. There is, first, the regular ministry; and, secondly, such forms of Christian service as are furnished by the employment of colporteurs, city missionaries, evangelists, Bible women, matrons, nurses, and the like. Now, in regard to the ministry, it is usually felt that our long curriculum in the Presbyterian Church is a fatal obstacle to many of the best and most earnest men. To married men, or men past the years of youth, it no doubt is; and it is not easy to suggest any method by which this difficulty can be overcome. But in the case of young men, it ought not to be a serious barrier. Young men have facilities for Christian service during the whole period of their studies, and if they have suitable gifts, would be gladly taken as helpers in mission work in some of the many fields where the harvest is so plenteous and the labourers so few. Their intellectual training would then go on side by side with practical work, and the risk of the life being all crushed out of them by the one, would be met by their being steadily employed in the other. We must say, that in these circumstances we have not much sympathy with earnest young men wishing to skip the curriculum. A sense of its need, and a willingness to undergo it, will rather be proof of their having in them the stuff that good, durable, ever-improving workers are made of; while, on the other hand, if they slight it as but wasted time and labour, and only think how they can avoid it, they indicate a superficiality of view that does not promise very valuable results.

With regard to the class of converts that do not contemplate the regular ministry, but are desirous to consecrate themselves to subordinate departments of the service, there is the greatest possible need for considering what course ought to be taken. It is evident that openings for such labourers exist in considerable numbers, and are increasing every day. Yet no Christian church in Scotland has made any systematic provision for the training of such labourers for their work. We conceive that the time has come for remedying this defect. An institution for training Christian workers has become an imperative necessity. Of course we shall be met by the objection that they could only get a smattering at such a college, and that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." But the question really lies between a little training and no

training at all. It is quite certain that we shall have evangelists, lay preachers, street preachers, colporteurs, and the like. As things are now, these labourers go forth with absolutely no training, except what they receive under the ordinary ministrations of their pastors. Is this the best state of things? Is it not rather the worst? Would not such men be infinitely better of a course of popular theology,—a course opening up the Bible and the Shorter Catechism, and giving them some hints in the art of speaking? Is there anything worse done, as a common rule, than street preaching? The preacher seems often to think that the louder he can bawl the more will he impress, and instead of a few, short, simple, natural words, pours out torrents of rant, that roll over the heads of unimpressed hearers. Would not a course of instruction help, too, to take the conceit out of the head of many a lay labourer prone to fancy himself vastly superior to ministers, just because he is utterly ignorant of how little he knows? And would it not free these labourers from the leaven of many errors into which they are prone to fall, and thus add greatly to their value, as well as give them a status which would increase their influence with the people? And female labourers are just as much in need of this training as male. We forbear entering further into the subject; but it would not be easy to exaggerate its importance.

Other questions present themselves in connection with the following out and following up of a revival, on which at present we have no time to enter. For example, How to get young converts to make their confession of Christ in a way fitted to rouse others, without offending that modest instinct which cannot be violated with impunity? Another question is, How to make practical use of a convert who has been turned from scandalous wickedness, without giving such details of that wickedness as may shock the sensibilities and pollute the imagination of well-trained moral natures? These are delicate questions, in handling which we are liable to dangers, both on the right hand and on the left, and on which those who incline to one side ought to beware of fierce and uncharitable judgments on the other. Especially ought there to be tenderness of judgment towards those who are manifestly influenced by a true and fearless zeal for bringing as many souls as possible under the influence of God's grace. It is but too apparent

that a problem of vast importance and difficulty remains to be solved. Even where the revival movement has been most profound and extensive, the masses of our town population have not been pervaded. Drunkenness, licentiousness, covetousness, selfishness, and ungodliness, still spread their polluted streams and poisoned atmosphere almost as extensively as ever. The great problem is to bring the revived life of the Church into contact with these. And we must not judge of the best means for that purpose by the standard that would apply to the inhabitants of boudoirs and drawing-rooms. When a boat has been upset, and scores of persons are struggling in the water, it may be necessary to extricate them more roughly than a mother would lift her babe from the cradle. The masses are the masses, and it is better they should be saved somewhat roughly than not saved at all.

W. G. BLAIKIE.

---

## ART. VI.—*Etruscan Researches.*

TAYLOR'S *Etruscan Researches.* London: Macmillan & Co. 1874.

ONE of the most interesting fields of philosophical investigation has been recently opened afresh by the Rev. Isaac Taylor in his "Etruscan Researches." Inquiries into the history of the Turanian nations are daily assuming more importance. Those of them whose location was in southern climates, made great progress in the arts. Such were the Accadians of Babylon, and the Etruscans of Italy. If by straining the word Turanian, we include also the Chinese in the same category of race, we have three great centres of civilised inventiveness among Turanian peoples. These circumstances shew that before we can complete the lost history of early human progress, we must attend specially to the archæology and the languages of Turanian nations.

Some reviewers of Mr Taylor's work have recognised the importance of investigating closely such questions as that which he takes up. And they have seen in the light he casts on the early connection of Asia and Europe, and on the mode in which Turanian usages and beliefs have influenced the

Roman mind, the augury of a new era of archæological discovery. To give this amount of sympathy to the work of Mr Taylor was right, for he has turned the sod of a new field, and laboured industriously to unveil the long-forgotten history of an ancient and civilised people, who, while they were the geographical neighbours of the Romans, were their instructors in the arts and in religion.

On the other hand, the comparative philologists have attacked Mr Taylor, and expressed scepticism in regard to the whole of his philological argument. This treatment is somewhat hard. Yet what can be expected to result from inquiries based on so small a number of words as have yet been collected from the Etruscan inscriptions, and from such few additional words as ancient authors have casually mentioned? A certain painful feeling of possible unreality must attend philological inquiry on this language, when, as Mr Taylor says, there are only three or four Etruscan words of which the meaning may be regarded as reasonably certain. To build up a theory of linguistic affinity on this very limited basis is a difficult undertaking. To these words have to be added proper names, suffixes, words collected from bilingual inscriptions, and a large number of conjectural expressions. They make in all about two hundred words in the list made by Mr Taylor after he had completed his comparisons. The decipherment of any lost languages, such, for example, as the Accadian from Babylonian inscriptions, is the work of many years, and must be conducted by patient, ardent workers, such as Norris, Sayce, and Lenormant. Then at last the clear light of proved resemblances crowns the explorer's efforts, and widens the area of philological research.

In Mr Taylor's translations of Etruscan sentences, the order of words is to such an extent Europeanised that we must either withhold complete confidence in the correctness of the translation, or admit a strong Aryan influence on the language. He often gives expression himself to a feeling that the translations are only hypothetical and tentative, and that the want of a literature is a sad drawback to any one undertaking the recovery of the Etruscan language. If the order of the words is that which he supposes it to be, the language was far from being purely Turanian, and was already much affected by Aryan or Semitic mixture. For example, "the bounden gift

of an unworthy fabric" involves the Semitic principle of the post-position of the genitive. This is an impossibility in pure Turanian languages, such as those of Tartary and South India, which require the nominative to come last.

Probably he has made too much of the numerals. Following Grimm, Mr Taylor states that resemblances in numerals are among the most unerring indications of linguistic affinity. This is true in the languages which belong to the Indo-European group, which were studied by Grimm to the exclusion of all others, and the reason is not far to seek. The mathematical faculty is strong among the Aryan people. The Hindoos have always been good calculators. The European races of this family are eminently commercial, and are fond of the exact sciences. These circumstances give permanence to the words which mark number. But what comes of Grimm's principle when you examine the numerals of other races? The Mongol nomad, when he speaks of "three," says *gorban* or *gorab*, the Manchoo, *ilan*, the Chinese, *sam*. Why do the Mongol and the Manchoo depart from Chinese analogy, and each use a different word? The reason lies in the weakness of the arithmetical faculty, caused by nomadic habits and perfect indifference in regard to commerce. Such a test of affinity as resemblance in numerals entirely breaks down here; while at the same time, the family relationship of Mongol and Manchoo is, on other grounds, as clear as any fact in philology. It ought, however, to be cheerfully admitted that some striking identities in names of number are here collected. *Ki*, "two;" Turkish, *iki*; *Huth*, "six;" Lapp and Wogul, *kot*; Hungarian, *hat*; *sa*, "four;" Chinese and Siamese, *si*.

Mr Taylor has a faulty mode of analysing Turanian words. As a rule, Tartar words have a root and a suffix; the first part of the word has a particular significance, the second part none. The latter, that is the suffix, determines moods, tenses, and derivative variations. The suffixes, while originally they undoubtedly had a proper meaning, have now come to be mere particles, whose original sense is hidden. Consequently it is not permitted to the investigator to take a Turkish or Mongol word and divide it into two roots. If there are such compounds, they are both rare and exceptional. Thus, Mr Taylor says, that the Turkish *sekis*, "eight," is *se*, "four," and *kis*, "two." "*Kis* seems to be the Ugric numeral for two. There-

fore *se-kis* would be thrice *se*, and *se* must have denoted 'four.'" Unfortunately Turkish words are not compounded in this way, and if they were, the order of collocation in this and in all other cognate languages would be the reverse of what Mr Taylor takes it to be. It would rather be *kis-se*.

There is another objection that may be raised to Mr Taylor's philological method. He has not been sufficiently careful in identifying sounds. For example, he wishes to find an Asiatic equivalent to the Etruscan *thapira*. In Buriat, which is a dialect of the Mongol spoken near the Baikal, he rightly says, that *kara* and *xara* both mean "black." He does not, however, mention that Castren's *k* is the aspirated *k*, and his *x* our *h*. The Buriat, and in fact all Mongol names for "black," are either *k'ara* or *hara*. "Very black," is *k'abk'ara* or *habhara*. He then proceeds to add, that *thapira* is an abraded form of *thapthara*, that this is *zapzara*, and this again is *xapxara*, *z* and *th* being interchangeable. Such reasoning is fallacious, because *z* cannot come out of *h*. The idea of blackness is in the radix *har*, and not in the incorporated syllable *ap* at all. Thus, *sabsaihan* is "very virtuous," from *saihan*. There is nothing of virtue in *ab*. It is simply intensitive, and is introduced on a principle which is very common in North American languages also, that of insertion between the letters of the root.

Great difficulties stand in the way of Mr Taylor's identification of the Etruscan *hinthial*, "ghost," with the Turkish *jan*, *jinn*, "soul," and the Chinese *shin*, "spirit." The Chinese *shin* can be deduced regularly from *din*, and the Turkish *jan* is the Persian and Arabic *jinn*, and therefore the Latin *genius*. The initial letters *d* and *g* should not be identified. It is not open to any philologist to compare *hinthial* with *shin* without first inquiring into the phonetic relationship of the initial letters.

For these and similar reasons, it seems plain that the main strength of Mr Taylor's argument is not in the philological part of the book, but in the correspondence of national customs and religious beliefs.

The fact that the Etruscan people were great tomb-builders, that they believed in the duty of ancestral worship, that they thought the dead needed the same weapons, ornaments, and utensils which they had used in life, that they regarded it as

proper to offer to them slaves, horses, dogs, and various articles of food, and that they constructed the house for the dead on the model of the abodes of the living, carries with it great force. There can be no doubt that this order of ideas is neither Semitic, Greek, Roman, nor Indian, and must therefore be derived from that of Eastern Asia.

The belief of the Chinese and other neighbouring nations is substantially the same as this at present, and has always been, so far as we can examine. The grave of a Chinese emperor is a large tumulus of earth, approached by a long vaulted passage of masonry. The tumulus is opened on the south. The vaulted passage branches off to the right and left at the entrance, and is of course continued inside the mound to the centre. In front of the passage entrance is the sacrificing hall, of immense proportions, and before it another smaller hall. The banquet to the dead is arranged, on occasion of the sacrifices, in the large hall, and a tablet is placed upon a throne to represent the deceased. The sacrificing party take their food in the front hall.

This mode of arrangement is remarkably like that followed in Etruscan tombs. "A singular and characteristic feature found in almost every Etruscan tomb is the large antechamber out of which the mortuary chambers open. This was the place where the whole family used to assemble at the annual funeral feast to worship the Manes and Lares of their ancestors, and make offerings to their spirits." In China the use of two halls, one for the sacrifices and the other for the feast of which the worshippers partook, forms no great deviation from the Etrurian fashion.

Another feature of similarity is found in the Etrurian practice of augury and sorcery. Since, however, augury by the flight of birds was specially developed by the Etruscan priesthood and certain kindred races in Western Asia, the area of resemblance is here limited to the existence of a class of sorcerers who acted as medicine men and exorcists in cases when evil spirits distress the human frame. At the present day, in any part of China or Siberia, when demons have to be dispossessed, professors of the art, who guarantee success, can be called in at any emergency.

The physical characteristics of the Etruscans were strikingly like those of the races of Eastern Asia. Black oblique eyes,

scanty beard, dark complexion, black curling hair, stout habit, high cheek bones, high coloured cheeks, mark them out as of Turanian origin. This description is strikingly true of the modern Tartar. Add to this the mental and moral peculiarities of this race. They were orderly, obedient to law, fond of tradition, conservative in temper. These are the very things that now mark the Chinese, and in a less degree, the Tartar races. They had the same fondness for colour, and the same success in arranging different colours, which we find in Eastern Asia, and especially among the Chinese and Japanese. Like the Chinese, they are celebrated for their vases. For success in this branch of art, one of the most necessary gifts is a natural eye for colour. If we pursue this line of thought, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that the Etruscans were Turanian. Mr Taylor has some very interesting remarks on the effects of the presence of this Turanian colony in southern Europe in fostering a taste for the fine arts and imparting some of their peculiar features to the great schools of art which afterwards sprang up in northern Italy.

This mode of argument would tend to lead us away from Siberia to the southern branches of the great Turanian race. A highly civilised development was impossible in Siberia. Those Turanian peoples who developed the arts were all located in temperate climates. They may have begun a new career of conquest in the cold north leading them to a warmer home where new surroundings may have stirred into life the latent power to originate some of the civilised arts. But those arts could scarcely grow up in a cold climate. Neither the Chinese, nor the Accadians, nor the Etruscans, if they had been permanently located in Finland or on the shores of the "holy" Baikal, could have attained eminence in the arts of civilised life.

Mr Taylor compares the Turks with the Etruscans, and thinks he finds in them a race equal in originating power. This seems to be giving to the Turks a credit they do not deserve. They have shewn, indeed, a genius for conquest and the control of subject races, but what civilised arts have they ever done anything to promote? Perhaps the reason they have not achieved eminence in advancing the conquest of nature by man, is that their destiny has been rather to rule, and that the cares of government have absorbed all their intellectual power.

The Etruscan religion resembled the Eastern Asiatic in several essential points. It was essentially the worship of cælestial, terrestrial, and ancestral spirits. The cælestial mean the supreme heaven; the terrestrial are the active powers which underlie the operations of nature; the ancestral spirits are the spirits of the dead. According to Chinese history, such was the religion of the old Turkish dynasty, known as the Hiung-nu, which ruled over the whole of Tartary two milleniums ago. Chinese historians have retained some words in the language of that people, and these are Turkish. Such are *tingri*, heaven, and *ugli*, son. They called their emperor "Son of heaven," and in this they were imitated by the Chinese emperors. Hence the preservation of these two words. But the same three classes of spirits were honoured, not only by this powerful Turkish dynasty, but by the ancient Chinese themselves, who consequently looked on the Turkish religion of the time as extremely rational. The usages of the Chinese are, however, on account of their marvellously rich literature, much better known than those of the ancient Turks.

Now it is a circumstance well worthy of consideration, that this triple worship was maintained in common by the Romans and the Chinese. By both races the terrestrial gods were honoured by the burial of the victims, and the cælestial by burning them or offering them unburnt upon altars or wooden stands in the fashion of a banquet. Another feature in common was the libation of wine or of water, poured on the ground or on the head of the victim. Either the Romans followed Etruscan examples in these remarkable customs, or brought them from Asia themselves. So also the peopling of all nature with spirits was as much Chinese as it was Roman. The bountiful food-bearing earth, the woods and fountains, the rivers, mountains, and lakes, all instinct with their own peculiar life, were inhabited by divine beings whom the Chinese thought themselves as much bound to worship as did the Romans. Whether this belief was Etruscan or Roman, Aryan or Turanian, it may be at present difficult to determine; but it was at any rate much the same thing three thousand years ago in China that it was in Italy. In the popular belief and the worship which accompanied it, there exist the most remarkable resemblances which call for profound study and carefully-formed conclusions. Another feature of the deepest interest

here occurs. A mythological series of four personages with names are figured on the Etruscan vases, viz., Kulmu, "god of the grave;" Vanth, "the spirit of death;" Hinthial, "ghost;" Nathum, "the fury," who pursues those guilty of great crimes and incites them to worse. These four names are mixed with Orestes, Achilles, Patroclus, Charon, Clytemnestra, and Odysseus in the *bas reliefs* of Etruscan tombs. On the walls of one of the most splendid of these, discovered in 1857, Achilles is represented slaying with his sword a Trojan prisoner, while Vanth, angel of death, and Hinthial Patrukles, the ghost of the deceased friend of Achilles, urge him to the act as a just retribution. Known names of Greek legends are thus mingled with certain new Etruscan names: the question is, what these are. Mr Taylor believes that he finds them in Finnish, Siberian, and Turkish mythology. Kulmu he believes to be the Kalma of the Finns. Castren, himself a Finlander, and a most industrious collector of philological and mythological facts, states that Kalma is the god who presides specially over the grave and its inhabitants. He cites also the Turkish *ghoul*, the loathsome spirit who haunts the graveyard and fattens on corpses. He might have gone farther, and adduced the Chinese *kwei* or *kut*, having the meanings, ghost, demon.

This identification looks extremely likely, and deserves to be carefully considered. The word may easily have grown out of a root meaning "breath," such as the Chinese *K'i*. From this it took the sense of "ghost," and further west, where it was the fortune of the word to be used by men accustomed to personification, it came to mean "spirit of the grave." The Chinese in their isolation, having no such neighbours as the Hebrews or the Greeks, and accustomed to give a realistic character to all the objects of thought, could not personify, and have never acquired the habit of idealisation. They probably represent truly a very old stage in the history of language and religion. Before the introduction of the personifying element by Semitic and Aryan races, there was, as we conceive, a time when the whole human family thought of God only as God, and of spirits as spirits. Out of this original basis polytheism grew, the product of the idealising faculty, when, for the first time, it clothed with human attributes the spirits of an older age. When Kulmu became a god among the Etruscans, and Kalma among the Finns, it was because these races were in

contact with western peoples who taught them to personify. It would have been well if Mr Taylor had adopted some such mode as this to account for the Etruscan mythology, and to reconcile it with the unpoetic and impersonal conceptions of the most primitive human types such as the Chinese.

For Vanth, the "angel of death," there is in the northern and eastern mythologies no ready-to-hand equivalent. We must here be content to wait for more light. Mr Taylor adduces in explanation the Turkish *vani*, "ready to perish," "death," "annihilation." But this is not much more than the Roman *vanus*. It may be asked respecting the Etruscans, if they could borrow Greek legends and names, could they not also borrow Latin words? Mr Taylor's principle of working is to explain everything, if possible, from Turanian sources. He believes that the Greek legends were of late introduction among the Etruscans. But it is certainly worthy of remark that in the striking and instructive illustrations which he has given us from vases, Vanth and Kulmu look quite as Greek as Achilles and Ajax. We shall perhaps find at last when Corssen's views, who has for some time been working at the problem in his thorough way, are known, that Vanth and Kulmu are but other names for more familiar divinities whom we knew when we were school-boys. We do not think that this possible result will, however, destroy Mr Taylor's hypothesis of a Turanian origin for the Etruscans. It will only help towards illustrating a still more important point, namely, how far had the Turanian type of language and mythology a direct influence on the Indo-European races. The great German investigator, who has now, after long familiarity with early Italian studies, been bending his best efforts to the Etruscan question, cannot but arrive at some interesting conclusions (and they are perhaps now ready for the press), for which the scholars of England and Germany are eagerly waiting.

One of the *dramatis personæ* of the groups which the ingenious Etruscan potters loved to work upon their vases and sarcophagi, was Hinthial. In 1835, Bunsen stated that it must mean "ghost," and quite correctly, as has been shewn by later discoveries. In that year the bronze mirror, which figures Ulysses calling up the spirit of the dead prophet Tiresias, was found at Vulci. Over the bending figure, with closed eyes and leaning on a staff, which represents the ghost, is written in

Etruscan letters, "Hinthial Tiresias." Ulysses is seated sword in hand. Hermes stands with right hand held out to Ulysses, suiting the action to his present occupation, which is to inform Ulysses that the ghost has arrived in his charge. His left arm and hand rest on the right shoulder and back of the ghost, indicating a sympathetic and painstaking care on the part of the divine guide, who, at the desire of the wise necromancer, has conducted the soul of the dead through the passages of the under-world. This highly interesting group leaves no doubt as to the correctness of Bunsen's explanation of the meaning of Hinthial. But there is another proof. In the tomb laid open to view in A.D. 1857 at Vulci, it has been already mentioned, that among the designs on the walls is a representation of Achilles slaughtering a Trojan prisoner to appease the ghost of his deceased friend Patroclus. Over the ghost, who looks on with pleased expression, is written "Hinthial Patrukles."

Hinthial, therefore, means "ghost," and we must explain the Etruscan idea by reference to the Homeric and Virgilian descriptions of the under-world. From the Finnish mythological poem, the Kalevala, we learn that the ancient Finns believed every stone, tree, brook, and spring, to have its guardian genius. This they called the *haldia* of the object. This word is by Mr Taylor identified with *hinthial*. To this there is no great objection, for *n* and *l* are in Turanian Asiatic languages interchangeable letters. Yet Mr Taylor might have found a nearer resemblance in the word *hwun*, "soul," used by the Buddhists in China, both for the disembodied and embodied soul of man. In books containing Buddhist legends of the lower world, it is common to use the word *hwun* for the soul of the deceased.

The argument gathers greatly in force when the word Manes is considered by our author. The Roman *manes*, the Etruscan *mean*, "guardian of the souls of the dead," and the Finnish *manalaiset*, "the people of the under-world," ought surely to be identified. Here, where the Chinese and Tartar languages give no aid, the existence of the wide-spread Finnic root *ma*, "earth," is very significant. *Minos*, the Cretan king of the dead; *amenti*, the Egyptian kingdom of the dead, can scarcely be separated from the same stock. But it is only among the Finns that the root seems to connect itself with a common word for earth, and therefore the Finnic word should

be regarded as more at home and more original than any of the corresponding names as used by Etruscans, Greeks, Latins, or Egyptians. Just as the spirits of China, without names or human characteristics, become gods with names and human attributes when they reach the neighbourhood of Greece and Mesopotamia, so the upright wooden tablets, which in China represent spirits, become in western regions idols with a human shape. The Romans and Etruscans kept in their houses little images to represent the souls of their ancestors, and in temples in the fields to represent the *lares arvales*. These images correspond to the upright slips of wood, with the title of the spirit inscribed on them, used from time immemorial in China to represent deceased ancestors and the presiding genii of the corn fields. The Chinese word for tablet is *chu*, meaning also lord, and its root is *tot*, the initial and final of which, by a common letter change, may easily become *l* and *r*. The word Lemur, meaning the "spirits of the dead," easily finds its equivalent in the Chinese *ling*, which by phonetic change has come from an older *lim*, and means the "spirits of the dead," as the Latin word does.

Mr Taylor concedes too much to certain modern views when he says, that in the Turanian and Aryan mythology all the supreme deities resolve themselves ultimately into the chief cælestial phenomena, the dawn, the sky, the sun, and the thunder. If it be asked of the author, Did not polytheism spring out of monotheism as its original basis? he cannot but feel that the question deserves an answer. Yet, he assumes in the statement just cited, that there was no monotheistic tradition in the commencement of the career of the Turanian and Aryan families. Polytheism probably came into existence in this way. First, there was the worship of the one God. Then was added the worship of angels and spirits. Afterwards, by contact of nations and mixture of races, the mythological spirit grew up. Legends and sagas were invented by individuals who had an ideal temperament, and these becoming popular, were adopted by the nations to which they belonged. This was the time of the origin of polytheism and of idolatry. Images were the outward shape that art gave to the ideal personages who had already become familiar to the imagination. At this time the human mind was very susceptible of impressions from external nature. The legend-forming faculty

was awake. The belief in spirits, as the animating principles residing in universal nature, was prevalent. The phenomena of light and darkness, of wind and thunder, of clouds and rain, were supposed to be produced by spiritual beings, whose special office it was, under the direction of the Supreme, to superintend these several departments of activity. Each god accumulated several names, and a special system of attributes. Among these were names which grew out of natural phenomena; the dawn, the evening twilight, the sun, supplied an abundance of these names.

The Chinese period of thought was intermediate between the original monotheism and the personifying period to which the world is indebted for polytheism and idolatry. In that intermediate age the idealizing faculty was too weak to personify and to construct a pantheon of man-resembling divinities.

The religion of the Book of Genesis is the simplest and most primitive to be found anywhere, because it knows only the first of these three stages. The Chinese and early Persian religion represent the second stage, when the worship of the powers of nature was added. The third and most composite form combines all three. Professor Max Müller has pointed out that monotheism underlies the Homeric phraseology. It existed along with the most advanced Greek polytheism. Among the Romans and Etruscans the existence of the worship of spirits reminds us of a more primitive stage in the religious history of man, out of which the Etruscan and Roman system sprang—in fact the Chinese stage. The poetic and progressive spirit of the Greeks pushed beyond the old landmarks with extreme rapidity. The rush of new ideas and the quick development of art among them prevented their regretting the loss of old forms of faith and worship which lingered in Italy much later.

The phenomenon in nature was not then the Grecian god. It was rather that which suggested a new name for the god who already existed in the faith of an older generation of men. The ancient religion of China, of Tartary, and of Siberia, represents an essential link in the religious history of man. No Aryan god leaped from nothing into existence at the bidding of the poetic observer of nature. He was either man or spirit. There was a regular gradation in the successive strata of mythology. The earlier stages of man's religious history must be

carefully examined, and their share in the upgrowth of later mythologies accurately estimated, before "the science of religion" can be presented in a complete form.

The real basis of the Greek and Roman religions, and with them the Hindoo and Persian, is approximately twofold, but ultimately one. That basis is partly Turanian and partly Semitic, but both spring in the first instance from the primitive religion of man, as professed by the great human family, before it became parted into nations and tribes.

The one-sidedness of the existing Sanscritist, or "solar myth," or Aryan school of mythology, is manifest in this, that it lays small stress on the transition from the above-mentioned two great schools of religious thought to the Aryan, but struggles painfully to shew how Aryan mythology grew into life self-originated and self-sustained.

We now find that there are good things in human religions. Some Christian men of former times could not see this fact, nor were they aware that it might be explained. The primitive religion of man, which lies at the basis of all the mythologies, had in it divine elements imparted by inspiration to the good men of the first ages; if so, surely the religions of the world deserve a most thorough study. There is something of God in them, and no Christian need fear to recognise and approve sound morality and the teaching of truth wherever he finds them.

JOSEPH EDKINS.

---

## ART. VII.—*The Reformed Church in the Netherlands.*

THE recent history of the Dutch Reformed Church presents a most important instance of the fierce contest which rages everywhere between the opposite theological tendencies of our time. The most advanced rationalistic principles held by some of its ablest men, accepted by a large number of its ministers, and predominating even in its highest church-courts, have perhaps nowhere found more complete development, both in their theoretical and practical bearings, or been expounded and maintained with greater sagacity, learning, and clearness. On the other side, the different shades of more orthodox

belief have found within the pale of the same Church most powerful and faithful friends who have not shrunk from doing what they could to oppose and overcome the prevailing rationalistic epidemic. Since everywhere the same principles are abroad, and the same contest is raging, it may be thought a matter of general interest to have an exact account of the battle as it has been fought in the Dutch Reformed Church.

To understand that battle, it is necessary to know the field on which it is waged.

The Dutch people have much in common with the Saxon element in England. Originated from the same stock, and trained by the same close contact with the sea, only in a more evere contest with it to recover and to keep their low lands from its dominion, they have much of the Anglo-Saxon love of freedom, practical sense, earnestness. and perseverance. Only no Norman Conquest has subjected them to its mighty consequences. Their middle age was characterised by much skilful industry, by freedom gained for their towns and corporations in many a fierce struggle with their princely houses, and by much practical piety, of which Thomas à Kempis' "Imitation of Christ" is a noble example.

The seed of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, found in the Netherlands a most congenial soil. Everywhere the wandering preachers of Reformation doctrine found thousands upon thousands ready to flock to their field-meetings, armed often with weapons for self-defence, and through the mighty working of the Spirit they covered the land with earnest believers in the truth as it is in Jesus. In vain powerful Spain tried to quench that fire. Through Motley's noble *History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic* and its continuation, it has oecome sufficiently well-known wherever the English language is read, how in one of the most glorious struggles of any land or time, the Dutch undertook, sustained, and ended successfully a fight for their liberties and their faith against all the resources of Spain, at that time by far the most influential power in Europe.

In such a school was formed a nation, begotten by the impulses of freedom, whose love of the Bible and its contents waxed only stronger and deeper under the combined rage of the Spanish inquisition and Spanish arms, which brought in a few years, it is said, at least eighteen thousand men and

women for truth's sake to the stake and the scaffold; a nation which, with nothing to rely on but their arm and their God, knew how to create, in the midst of a most vehement war, a world-wide trade, which brought them the treasures of immense wealth, and to erect schools of learning which commanded respect throughout Protestant Europe; a nation that succeeded in closing their war of eighty years with their giant adversary maimed for ever, and themselves a thriving, influential and respected State.

The form in which reforming principles prevailed among the Dutch was the Calvinistic creed, in the practical shape of the Heidelberg Catechism and a Presbyterian church polity. Their deep religious faith, fostered by the necessity of practical dependence upon God in great straits during the war, made them earnest believers in the doctrine of predestination, and warm opponents of Arminius and his fellow-remonstrants. The five articles of the Synod of Dort in 1618 and 1619, became part of the symbols of the Dutch Reformed Church.

For nearly two centuries after the Synod of Dort, the Reformed Church was the Church of the State, with the beautiful martyr-confession of Guido de Bres and the Heidelberg Catechism, together with the "five articles," for its symbols, and subject to the church-order contained in the *Post-acta* of the Synod of Dort. During a long period it remained a stronghold of reformed orthodoxy, honoured by the labours of such men as Voetius and Coccejus, Markius and Witsius, Vitringa, Venema, and the Schultenses, and many more, who secured to the Dutch Reformed Church a prominent influence on reformed theological science, till at the end of last century, under the yoke of French influences, those bands which had bound the Church to the State were broken. Under some vacillations in practice, they have never been legally restored.

Zeal for the old contra-Remonstrant doctrine had much abated during the eighteenth century, to such an extent indeed, that at the close of it the French Revolution had so far taken hold of the usually sober Dutchmen, that the French revolutionary troops were actually called in as the saviours of Dutch society. Though the rude experience of the French invasion soon destroyed this delusion regarding French revolutionary principles, a superficial humanism had power enough to erect and sustain an influential society, *Tot nut van het*

*Algemeen* (for the public benefit), which, through schools, lectures, and popular writings, promoted a superficial morality, coloured with a tinge of sentimental religion based on the general fatherhood of God, much in the sense of Zschotke's *Stunden der Andacht.* Even the society for the defence of the Christian religion, founded amongst others during the last quarter of last century at the Hague, to combat the prevailing scepticism of the age, bestowed its honours on works, in many respects able and useful, but for the most part more or less affected with the tendency to remove the landmarks of the old orthodox teaching.

Shortly after the restoration of a new free, national life on the fall of Napoleon, when the Netherlands became a constitutional kingdom under William of Orange, a new church-order was devised for the Dutch Reformed Church, in which the relation of the Church to its symbols was entirely altered. Hitherto every candidate for the ministry had been required to subscribe the rigid form, fixed in the *Post-acta* of the Dordracene Synod, whereby he declared his firm adhesion to the doctrine of the church-symbols ; but the form of subscription prescribed in 1816, and for nearly forty years demanded, was, that the future ministers bound themselves to preach the doctrine, which, " according to the Word of God," was contained in the accepted symbols of the Dutch Reformed Church. Now this form is ambiguous in an essential point. It might mean, that the candidates declared thereby, that they should preach the doctrine of the symbols, because (*quia*) or only in so far as (*quatenus*) it was contained in God's Word. So great was the apathy felt in 1816 for the doctrines contained in the symbols, that this ambiguity remained unobserved both within and without the Synod. Several years even passed before it became the occasion of a serious struggle, at the time of a crisis in the church, which has given origin to the whole recent contest between rationalism and orthodoxy. Then it became clear what a fundamental change in the character of the Dutch Reformed Church had been effected by this alteration in the form of subscription. No longer the confession of God's truth, but the observance of human church-order had become the bond of unity in the Church. The authority of ecclesiastical laws stood above the authority of the essential points of Christianity.

Still the general belief of the Church at that period was not

in direct antagonism to the doctrine of the symbols. As a rule, the Bible was held in honour; the old supernaturalistic views were retained, though without much earnestness or thoroughness. The leading divines were Muntinghe, professor of divinity in Groningen, who had much in common with the Swiss Hess; Heringa, professor of divinity at Utrecht, better known for scholarship and shrewdness in ecclesiastical policy than for orthodoxy; Van der Palm, professor of oriental languages at Leyden, an able orientalist, a fine moralist, and the eloquent orator of the time; and Clarisse, professor of divinity at Leyden, a man of immense learning, and one of the most earnest orthodox of the day, but of the old supranaturalistic school, which was unable to stem the rising tide of rationalistic opinion. Rationalism was represented with respectable ability, but great coldness, by Donker Curtius and Van der Willigen, ministers of the gospel at Arnhem and Tiel; with more daring and boldness by Bosveld, minister of the gospel at Dort; with open denial of the true Deity of Christ, by P. W. Brouwer; and it exercised an increasing attraction over many minds.

On the other side, earnest witnesses for the truth were not entirely awanting. The second centenary of the Synod of Dort in 1819 was made the occasion by Nicolaas Schotsman, minister of the gospel at Leyden, to preach and publish a couple of sermons, as a "monument" in honour of the Synod. This publication brought down upon its author a perfect storm of opposition and abuse. But also a mighty ally entered the lists against his opponents. This ally was Bilderdyk, one of the greatest poets and intellects of this century, whose whole character made him opposed to the new rationalistic doctrines. He began his public opposition against them by prefixing a preface to the second edition of Schotsman's *Monument*, wherein he retorted the censure heaped upon that work; but exerted a lasting influence upon the recent history of the Dutch Reformed Church through some very able young men, who were brought under the spell of his genius: Groen van Prinsterer, the learned editor of the *Archives de la Maison d'Orange Nassau*, and the noble leader of the juridic-orthodox party in the Church, and of the anti-revolutionary party in the State in all the recent struggles; Willem de Clerck, a warm friend of sound principles in Church and State, and an inspired

*improvisatore;* Capadose, a converted Jew, who found his joy in confessing Jesus as Jehovah against the rationalistic detractors of the divine glory of his Messiah; and another converted Jew, Isaac da Costa. The latter, a Portuguese Jew of high social standing, was first attracted to Bilderdyk by the sympathy of a kindred poetic genius, but soon, through Bilderdyk's influence, was led to earnest inquiries about the truth of Christianity, and in that way induced to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, and with all the zeal of an earnest convert to use his great talents in the contest with prevailing errors. He published in 1823 a pamphlet, in which, with unsparing severity, he set forth his complaints against the spirit of the age. It made a deep impression among the people, but offended to the quick the leading Church circles, and caused him much opprobrium.

Among the ministers of the gospel, too, there were not lacking warm defenders of the old truth. D. Molenaar, minister of the gospel in the Hague, in his "Address" to his reformed co-religionists (published in 1827), exposed the ambiguity of the form of subscription as well as the general indifference or hostility to the articles of the Synod of Dort. Nine editions in one year proved the amount of interest aroused by this address. The breath of religious revival passing over a large part of Protestant Europe was not without its effect on the Dutch Church. Religious indifference gradually diminished. The leaven of new spiritual life stirred up zeal for reformation doctrine among the people. On the other hand, rationalistic tendencies became more bold in their manifestation; while the ruling powers in the Church courts, in correspondence with the imperious influence of King William I., were trying to maintain the prevailing ambiguity with respect to the obligation to teach the doctrine of the symbols and to strengthen the authority of the Church laws.

These different tendencies brought matters to a crisis in 1834. The reviving interest in the doctrine of the Church symbols made many Church members unwilling to submit to the administration of rationalistic ministers, who became more and more outspoken. Some orthodox pastors, in compliance with the wishes of orthodox church members belonging to other parishes than their own, but in opposition to the letter

or spirit of the church laws, baptised children from other parishes, and preached in them, without the necessary consent of the rationalistic pastors. Some of them also declined to submit to the explicit order of the General Synod to give out at every public religious service, besides the psalms, a hymn from the somewhat lax collection which, since the commencement of the century, had been in use. This brought upon them the censure of the church authorities, who, inactive enough against very serious deviations from church doctrine, would not suffer one church law to be disregarded. The refractory pastors refused to submit, and as congregations clung to their deposed ministers, there arose a Secession Church, of which the first ministers were De Cock of Ulrum in Groningen, Scholte of Genderen and Doeveren in North Brabant, and Brummelekamp of Hattem in Gelderland. Government sought to repress this movement by fining and imprisoning the seceding ministers, by quartering soldiers upon their adherents, and so forth, but these measures had the usual effect of fanning the flame. Although such persecution did not last very long, the Secession Church has become a lasting institution in the Netherlands. Notwithstanding many internal divisions and large emigrations from among its membership to the United States of America, it comprises at present several tens of thousands scattered all over the land.

The largest and more influential portion of the orthodox party did not join the Secession. Though sympathising with the seceders in their dogmatic convictions and in their sufferings, they thought the points of church order by which the Secession was occasioned not of sufficient importance for them to break their connection with the Church, of which they were the genuine children, and thereby to leave the mass of the people to the unchecked influence of rationalistic error and indifferentism. They did what they could to counteract the prevailing mischief. Some disciples of Bilderdijk, Da Costa, Koenen, and De Clerck, commenced about that time to publish a periodical entitled, *Dutch Testimonies on Religion, Politics, History, and Literature*, which for several years exercised considerable influence among the better educated classes.

In 1835 the general Synod was earnestly entreated to remove the ambiguity in the subscription-form of 1816, and to declare peremptorily that ministers of the Dutch Reformed

Church were bound to preach the doctrines contained in the church-symbols. It declined to comply. Only in 1841, after renewed petitions, it declared that the old and solid foundations of the Dutch Reformed Church were in no wise loosened, and that the existing forms of subscription, though not enjoining the acceptance of the whole contents of the symbols, not only implied belief in some truth or other, but in general in that doctrine which, in its essence and spirit, constituted the main point of the Confession of the Reformed Church. These proved to be only empty words. Nothing was done to enforce them. Rigorous in expelling those true sons of the church, who, from earnest zeal for the spiritual interests of conscientious church-members, dared to trangress a trifling injunction of church-law, they were anxious to shelter principles which undermined the very foundations of the Church's existence.

About the same time the liberal tendencies took a more definite shape, chiefly in Groningen, one of the northern provinces of the land. In 1834 P. Hofstede de Groot, professor of divinity at the university in the capital of that province of the same name, with two ministers of the gospel at the same place—C. H. van Herwerden, and M. A. Amshoff—published a collection of essays, which set forth that view of Christianity which has during thirty years, under the name of the Groningen School, exerted considerable influence all over the land. Formed chiefly under the influence of Van Heusde, professor of history and Greek classics at Utrecht, an enthusiastic follower of Socrates and Plato, called by Lücke "Præceptor Hollandiæ," with secondary influences from Muntinghe, Herder, Hess, and Ullmann, and based on an independent study of the gospels, together with the writings of Wessel Ganzevoort,[1] Erasmus, Grotius, and the like, the characteristic of this school was a somewhat mystical humanism, of which the person of Jesus, according to the gospel-history, was the centre. This was not expounded with any marked intellectual acumen; eminent practical zeal formed its chief recommendation.

As its root was laid in student societies at Utrecht and Groningen, so the school was nursed mainly in the latter city, where its chief members, as professors at its university and ministers in its churches, found themselves together in a society which

[1] A Groningen precursor of the Reformation.

received the name of "Waarheid in liefde" ("Truth in Love"). Essays on religious matters were read and discussed. What was approved was published in a periodical of the same name, which for years, in a popular, scientific form, brought the characteristics of the school before the public; while its more scientific expositions are to be found in the *Compendia* of the different branches of theological science published by the divinity professors at Groningen.[1]

Accepting Christianity as the historical relevation of God in the person of Jesus Christ, and as His education of the human race thereby to the fellowship of His life, they attached chief importance to the historical person of Jesus. To the biblical records they gave value only as far as they represented that person,—chiefly therefore to the Gospels; but even to the evangelists they did not ascribe infallibility. They held it to be a fact that the apostles and evangelists in general, without being *infallible*, had *not failed*,—*i.e.* they did not believe on the ground of any special influence of the Holy Ghost on the hearts and minds of the apostles, that as such they could not have erred; but they professed to find, on historical grounds, that in point of fact the apostles, in the preaching of the Gospel, did not err: though on this, as on many other points in their system, much haziness was left as to how far this freedom from error went, and how it could be established. A more valuable characteristic of the school with respect to the sources of our knowledge of Christianity is, that they added the history of the Church to the Bible. They were in earnest to see in the Church history God's continued revelation of Himself and education of mankind in Jesus Christ. Church history was to them a continuation of Christ's life on earth, a manifestation of Christ and His work, such as He gave while on earth, and therefore an important means of knowing God in Him, and of being acted upon by God through Him. To these sources they attached authority in so far as they form a record of the powerful, all-changing facts of the mission, person, work, teaching, passion and death, resurrection and Church-rule of the Son of God; but not in so far as they

[1] P. Hofstede de Groot, Pareau, and Muurling. An interesting account of the origin, characteristics, and history of the Groningen School, is given by P. Hofstede de Groot, in an oration addressed to his disciples in 1854, on the occasion of his having occupied for five-and-twenty years, one of the chairs of divinity at Groningen.

contain utterances of the apostles regarding these facts, far less any dogmatic exposition of them by the apostles. Such apostolic exposition might, indeed, serve to guide their thoughts, but were not binding on them. They claimed a right to form their own opinion upon the revelation-facts, and to follow it, even where it differed from the exposition of the apostles. With the supranaturalists, they accepted a special revelation of God in Christ's person, life, and work (from which they did not exclude miracles); but, with the rationalists, they submitted the contents of this special revelation to human reason, accepting them only in the sense given by, and on the authority of, their own reason.

With regard to man's moral condition, some of them, with Pareau in his *Compendium of Moral Theology*, described the fundamental character of sin as sensuality; others, with Hofstede de Groot, as egoism; but all denied the total depravity of man's moral nature, and therefore took the aim of Christianity to be the education of mankind, or the development of the germ of spiritual life which is left in every human heart. The person of Jesus held with them the foremost place. Their Christian dogmatic commences with Christology. But Jesus is to them not true God in the sense of the Nicene symbol. Although, according to most of their leading men, He had a personal pre-existence, during which He was educated for His work on earth, He is to them a God, to whom they do not ascribe eternity,—the Son of God in the same sense only as believers, though in a much higher degree of perfection, whose heavenly person was by His incarnation united with the human body in the sense of Apollinaris, whose life on earth was without sin, and who in His heavenly life after His resurrection is personally present with, and working in His Church. This latter point, though of vital value for their view of Christianity, stands in glaring inconsistency with their whole idea of the person of Christ. Yet in their writings they never appear to be at all conscious how contradictory it is to represent Christ in His higher nature as a finite being, and at the same time as personally present always and everywhere with His Church in heaven and on earth.

Jesus' death is to them not fundamental or central in the work of man's redemption. His principal work on earth was not to die, but to form and unite the apostles as the germ of

the universal Church; while His death as a revelation of man's sinfulness, of His own moral perfection, and of God's love toward sinful men, gave a shock to the world, which has gradually caused the lower sensual life to die and the higher spiritual life to rise. The Holy Ghost is with them the principle of life in Christ, by Him implanted and nurtured in the heart of believers,—a holy disposition therefore, not a Divine Person.

In correspondence with these characteristics of their theology, the Groningen school did not care to enter into deep theological studies of any kind. Their school has produced very few writings on biblical exegesis and criticism, on church history, or on systematical theology, of a thoroughly scientific nature or of lasting value. The chief character even of their more scientific writings, as of their whole work, was practical, but not without some originality and solidity.

This half-rationalistic Christianity, stated only positively and with studied abstinence as far as possible from polemic against more orthodox views, recommended further by the practical zeal of its advocates and by a certain mystic warmth, found throughout the land, but especially in Groningen and other northern provinces of the Netherlands, much acceptance. On the other hand, it met with earnest opposition. This manifested itself first in many polemical pamphlets, sermons, and articles in periodicals. It took a more serious shape in addresses to the General Synod, urging the necessity of maintaining the doctrines of the Church symbols. The Synod, in a haughty manner, disposed of these addresses, as long as they proceeded from ministers and people of not much acknowledged social influence, without taking serious notice of them. But in 1842 came an address from seven prominent laymen of the Hague, all disciples of the school of Bilderdijk, under the leadership of Groen van Prinsterer, wherein they brought under the notice of the Synod the serious deviation of the Groningen theologians from the fundamental doctrines of the Church symbols, with an earnest entreaty to maintain these doctrines against prevailing errors. The Synod declared itself incompetent to entertain accusations of heresy, since the lower Church courts were, according to Church law, the proper judges before whom such accusations ought to be brought. This was technically true. At the same time, by declining to do, what certainly did belong to their province as Church fathers, viz., to declare their earnest

disapprobation of obvious deviation from the fundamental truths of the symbols of the Dutch Reformed Church, the Synod forsook its duty, and shewed an inexcusable indifference toward the vital interests of the Church. This opposition, though unsuccessful with the Synod, had the effect of directing public attention to the true character of the new school of theology, especially when the same seven laymen, at the commencement of the following year, published an address to the Reformed Church in the Netherlands, exhorting it to withstand the dangerous errors of the Groningen school, and to do what it could to remove them from the pale of the Church. Nor did the movement stop there. In 1845 an association of Christian friends was organised, with Groen van Prinsterer as president, which met twice a-year for the purpose of conferring on the religious position of the time. These meetings lasted till 1854, with a monthly periodical as their organ, called *The Union Christian Testimonies*, whose editor was the Rev. O. G. Heldring, minister of the gospel, of Hemmen, in Gelderland, best known as founder and director of an asylum for fallen women and several other institutions of Christian philanthropy. As a means of Christian fellowship, as a testimony and an opportunity of preparing measures against prevailing errors, and as a centre of Christian labours, these meetings did much good during the time of their existence. But they included very different elements,—secessionists and anti-secessionists, rigid orthodox and some evangelicals, some radical individualists and some warm friends of Church-organisation, those who would act against rationalistic errors chiefly on legal grounds, and some who wished to overcome them chiefly through the truth. Hence they failed to exert a lasting influence, and, after some years, had to be discontinued. Besides, in accordance with the indication given by the Synod in 1842, proceedings were instituted before the proper Church courts, in 1846, against Dr Rutgers van der Loeff, one of the most able and thorough-going representatives of the Groningen school, on the occasion of his being called to the ministry at Leyden; and, in 1854, against Dr Meyboom, one of the most speculative and radical members of the same school, when he was called to the ministry at Amsterdam. Both were without success, although both these gentlemen had published writings which proved clearly their deviation from the doctrine of the Church symbols. In the

first case, the Church courts simply denied the fact of heterodox doctrine; in the second, though implicitly admitting that fact, they asserted that it must first be proved what the doctrine of the Church symbols really was. It was clear that the Church's right to possess some guarantee that ministers should preach the essential doctrines of the Church symbols, was being sacrified by the Church courts to an unlimited liberty of teaching on the part of the ministers.[1]

By the side of these struggling parties were some others, who belonged to neither of them, yet deserve to be indicated in any true picture of the religious position of the Netherlands at that time.

In the first place, the position of the Remonstrants demands notice. The prevailing indifference about dogmatical orthodoxy had completely changed their relations. They, as well as the Mennonites[2] (though not the recent "old orthodox" seceders), were acknowledged as brethren by the leading circles in the Dutch Reformed Church. Ministers of that Church occupied their pulpits, though it was not custom to let them occupy the pulpits of the Dutch Reformed Church. The Missionary Society at Rotterdam was open to them as well as to the ministers and members of the National Church. No wonder; for, as a rule, the Remonstrant ministers were nearer to orthodoxy than a large portion of the ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church. Chiefly there was one very remarkable man among them, Dr Abraham des Amorie van der Hoeven, junior. His father, of the same name, was professor in the theological seminary of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, and during many years shared with van der Palm the reputation of being the most eloquent preacher of the day. His eloquence was perhaps more brilliant, and that of van der Palm more substantial; but his theological convictions were very much the same as van der Palm's—a not very pronounced supranaturalism with Christian morals in the fore-

[1] Among many polemical writings directed against the Groningen school, special attention is due to the three letters of Dr Doedes (then minister of the gospel at Rotterdam) addressed to Dr Meyboom, on the Infallibility of the Apostles, on the Deity of the Son of God, and on the Atonement through the blood of the Cross. They describe and refute the Groningen errors on these points in a fair and solid manner.

[2] The Baptists of the Netherlands, called after Menno Simons, their leader in the Reformation period.

ground. A far more remarkable man was his son, the minister of the Remonstrants at Utrecht. Of deep religious feeling, with a very penetrating and clear intellect, considerable theological scholarship and general culture, he left his mark on his time during his short life. In earnest about all that was essential in the old supranaturalism, he had overcome its mechanical view of the relations of the supranatural to the natural. Religion was to him the essential characteristic of human nature, and dogmas were not a dead ballast for the intellect, but the scientific expression of vital supranatural realities, of which Christ is the Alpha and the Omega. He believed even in predestination, certainly not of the old Dordracene type, but much nearer to that than the belief of the great majority of ministers in the Dutch Reformed Church. In a leading periodical of general literature, *De Gids*, he published, in 1846, in an article on the Compendia of the Groningen School, his judgment on that school, wherein he bestows much praise on the central place which it gave to the historical person of Christ, and on the essentially Dutch character of its theology. At the same time, he exposes with much power its superficiality in stopping at the outward life of Christ, without penetrating to His divine glory, and at the outward facts of God's revelation, without entering into the deep truths which lie hidden in them.

Two other tendencies were also at work, both of them more scientific and scholarly than the Groningen school. The one which was more positive, had the university of Utrecht as its centre, where, at that time, the divinity chair of Biblical Exegesis and Criticism was occupied by Bouman, a learned and accurate exegete; that of Christian Dogmatics, by Vinke, who wrote an elaborate answer to the objections which the periodical of the Groningen school had published against his defence in one of his sermons of the infallibility of the apostles; and that of Church History, by Royäards, a disciple of van Heusde, a man of considerable research, chiefly in the sources of Dutch church history. At that university there arose, about the same time, two very able men—Dr Doedes and Dr van Oosterzee—both of whom were first ministers of the gospel at Rotterdam, and afterwards professors of divinity at Utrecht. The former is a man of great dialectic power, a master in critic and exegesis; the second, of great imaginative power, the most eloquent and popular preacher of recent times in the Dutch

Reformed Church. In 1845, in conjunction with Dr Kemink and the professor *juris civilis*, de Geer, both able orientalists, they started a new quarterly periodical, *Year Books for Scientific Theology*, in which many very good essays are to be found, of lasting value to theological science. The other tendency referred to was more rationalistic, though not seldom with a cold supranaturalistic background. It had for its organ *The Theological Contributions*, and for its representatives Donker Curtius of Arnhem, van der Willige of Tiel, and van Hengel, professor of divinity at Leyden. The latter is a man of great exegetical ἀκρίβεια, but of equal prejudice against the divine glory of Christ, and against vital Christianity.

At the same time a severe contest was raging between philosophy and Christianity at Utrecht. Opzoomer, a man of considerable dialectical powers, of large general knowledge, and of great eloquence, who at that time sympathised with the philosophy of Krause, was nominated professor of logic and metaphysics at Utrecht. In his inaugural oration on *Philosophy reconciliating man with himself*, he gave to philosophy the place which belongs to Christianity, and even dared to call Christianity a "wasp-nest of fables." With considerable eagerness he sought encounters with the friends of Christianity, publishing a criticism, first of Dr van Oosterzee respecting the place which he gave to sentiment in Christian apologetics, then against an essay of Dr Scholten, on the doctrine of the Trinity, all in a very haughty spirit of hostility against Christianity. This disturbed the proverbial equanimity of the Dutch to a considerable extent. Amidst a shower of pamphlets, sermons, and periodical articles, he was chiefly opposed by Dr Scholten in his brochure, *Opzoomer criticised on the field of Theology and Philosophy;* by Dr Hofstede de Groot, in an essay in the Groningen periodical for 1847, *On the present relation of Philosophy to Christian Theology in the Netherlands*, and by Dr Doedes in a treatise, wherein he ably maintained the right of Christianity against philosophy, by shewing the incompetency of the latter to judge of the truth of the gospel history otherwise than in the way of historical criticism. The excitement soon subsided; though Professor Opzoomer, having subsequently accepted the empirical method of philosophy, has exercised considerable influence in the Dutch Reformed Church through some able disciples, chiefly through Dr Pierson.

A far more influential event, and one which has indeed determined the character of the whole history of the Dutch Reformed Church during the last five-and-twenty years, was a publication by Dr J. H. Scholten in 1848. Dr Scholten is a man of rare intellectual powers and vast scholarship, possessed of a very logical mind and a sharp critical faculty, of an energetic and an imperious will, with considerable powers of systemisation, and a good writer. Educated at the University of Utrecht, he was, after a short term of ministry in a country parish, called to occupy the chair of dogmatical theology at Leyden. As such, he published in 1848 the first, and in 1850 the second volume of his *Doctrine of the Reformed Church expounded in its principles from the sources and criticised.* With this book began a new period in the recent history of the Dutch Reformed Church. In idea and spirit it has much in common with Schweizer's *Glaubenslehre der Evangelisch Reformirten Kirche,* but in its method and contents it has sufficient character of its own to make it a thoroughly original work. It is written evidently with the intention to influence the relation of the Dutch Reformed Church to her symbols. The General Synod in 1841 had declared that the existing church-organization bound the ministers to accept that doctrine which in its nature and spirit made up the essence and the main points of the Confession of the Reformed Church. In 1842 it had refused to explain these words in the sense which the seven eminent laymen of the Hague, in their address, had laid before it—viz., that the "essence and main point" of the Confession meant, what according to the mind of the authors of the symbols and of the Dutch Reformed Church was their essence and main point. This explanation Dr Scholten professes to give in his book; but, instead of an historical exposition of what Calvin, de Bres, Ursinus, and the Dordracene Church fathers themselves held to be the essence and the main point of their doctrine, Dr Scholten gave as such what they ought to have held according to the spirit and principles of the Reformation which they promoted. Consequently, under forms taken from the old Reformed church-symbols and dogmatics, set forth and sifted with much scholarship and ingenuity, his book contains Dr Scholten's own system of dogmatics—a system diametrically opposed to the spirit and principles of Calvin, de Bres,

Ursinus, and the Dordracene Synod, but presented to the reader as though it were recommended by the piety and learning of these old worthies. That system is substantially the same as has ever since characterised Dr Scholten's school. It is expressed in innumerable other writings of himself and his disciples. Compared with those of the Groningen school, it is a characteristic of these writers that, while the productions of the Groningen school are nearly without exception scientific-popular, those of Dr Scholten's school are, with the exception of a few volumes of mostly unpractical sermons, thoroughly scientific both in form and contents. The most interesting, after his *Doctrine of the Reformed Church*, for a knowledge of Dr Scholten's system are his *Initia Dogmatica Christianæ, pars formalis et pars materialis; History of Christian Theology during the period of the New Testament; On Free Will; On Materialism*, &c.

In the *pars formalis* of his *Initia* he proclaims the Holy Scriptures to be the only source of our knowledge of Christian truth, and its only touchstone; but he presses strongly the difference between the Holy Scriptures and the Word of God, maintaining that the Word of God contained in Holy Scripture can only be recognised through the testimony of the Holy Ghost. This testimony he describes as the testimony of human nature itself, which, educated through Christianity to its original destination, acknowledges freely and independently the Word of Christ and His manifestation to be divine truth; or (in another place) as the consciousness of agreement betwixt the revelation of God in man's own reason and conscience when liberated from the service of sin by Christ, and the Christian revelation in Holy Scripture. According to Dr Scholten's own statement, that testimony of the Holy Ghost can relate only to religious matters. He writes therefore: "Factorum historicorum commemorationem verbi Divini notio non complectitur." Though a large part of the historical facts of Christ's life and person are acknowledged by him as true on historico-critical grounds, yet these facts are to him not essential to the existence and power of Christianity. On the critical questions of the history of the first Christian century, and of the authenticity of the books of the New Testament, he sympathises in many respects with the school of Baur of Tübingen. The Gospel of John has, during recent years,

become a special butt for his negative critic. Not long ago, in a separate brochure, he has denied that the apostle John was ever in Asia Minor.

In connection with this doctrine of the testimony of the Holy Ghost, his school makes a distinction between the objective manifestation (φανέρωσις) of the truth, "quae extrinsecus sive in naturâ rerum adspectabili aut historia sive verbo profetico aut factis extraordinariis, homini a Deo communicatur aut ostenditur," and revelation (ἀποκάλυψις), whereby the objective manifestation, "subjective ab ipso homine agnoscitur."

The chief character of the material part of Dr Scholten's system is, that it is the most absolute determinism in which the sternest necessity rules over all, and which leaves no place to moral liberty either in God or in man.

Dr Scholten has been charged with Pantheism, but has denied that charge. And truly in his *Initia Dogm. Christ. pars materialis* (chap. i. sec. 3), it is written that God is "omnium rerum causa absoluta sui conscia," and in section 4:

"Deus quatenus omnium rerum causa infinita, distinguendus a mundo, rerum finitarum ordine, est, metaphysice dicitur mundi causa transiens s. transcendens; quatenus vero a mundo non separandus, in rebus finitis vivit, operatur, patefit, mundi dicitur causa immanens. Utraque agnoscendo, Dei transcendentia et immanentia, distinguitur theologia Christiana cum a Mysticismo et Pantheismo Deum ab homine et a mundo diversum negantibus, tum vero a Pelagianismo et Deismo, Deum ab homine et mundo separantibus."

No expression is found in his writings in direct contradiction with these statements. But this does not imply that Dr Scholten's system is really free from the tendency to Pantheism. His doctrine of Determinism, with his denial of the moral freedom of man; his description of the transcendency of God, not in the biblical sense of being above the world, but as being the cause of the world, consequently his idea that God really exists only "immanent in the world," in the usual sense of the word, point in a pantheistic direction. So does the following statement:

"Causæ notio quum ferat ut sine re causata, ipsi causæ adæquata, existere nec cogitari queat, Deus similiter, omnium quippe rerum causa absoluta, sine objecto patefactionis ipsi adæquato cogitari nequit. Mundus autem quum causæ absolutæ patefactio adæquata, non nisi sub specie æternitatis, formaque ejus absoluta, haberi queat, sequitur Deum patefieri sibi in mundi exemplari perfecto, quod infinita qua est sapientia

ab æterno condidit, atque virtute omnipræsenti in mundo visibili efficere gradatim pergit. Exprimitur hoc placito de sapientia et τῷ Λόγῳ itemque de Spiritu sancto."

Here the world is represented as necessarily bound up with God's existence. Take again his declaration (in sec. 10), "Fons et principium creationis est ipsa natura Dei;" or his tendency to disregard the difference between physical and moral life; or his description of sin as being not "in homine principium, potentia, sive ens positivum, sed vitæ spiritualis, hoc est principiorum atque potentiæ moralis in homine absentia, verbo, negatio ejus quod esse eum ex idea hominis oporteat"; and in another place, "Sin (as dominion of the lower passions over the spirit) bears the character of animal selfishness, belonging by nature, and of necessity, to the animal life." All these leading parts of his system are symptoms of a Pantheistic creed, and neutralise in a large measure the theistic dogma with which they are connected.

His doctrine of the Trinity is expressed in these words:

"Divinæ naturæ cum sit consequens, ut Deus, qualis ab æterno in Λόγῳ idealiter sibi patefit, Spiritus sui efficacitate realiter in mundo patefiat, hoc sensu triunus dici potest;" and—"Personas in trinitate ecclesiæ reformatæ doctores, præeunte Calvino, tres individuos esse negarunt, tres in Deo existendi modos, τρόπους ὑπάξεως recte affirmarunt."

In other places he denies the personal pre-existence of the Logos before His life on earth.

The solution which Dr Scholten gives of his doctrine of Determinism is, that all men, sooner or later, here or hereafter, must of necessity be delivered from sin through the inevitable influence upon man's nature of the spirit of Christ, or the religion manifested in Christ.

This system, expounded with great sagacity, scholarship, and clearness, made a deep impression on the religious world in the Netherlands. In Leyden, a considerable number of talented young men—Kuenen, van Bell, Rauwenhoff, and many others—accepted the Scholtenian system with unbounded enthusiasm; expounded under the inspiration and guidance of the master the main points of his system in special academical dissertations,[1] or applied his principles to spheres excluded from Dr Scholten's direct attention, as Dr Kuenen in his *Intro-*

[1] *E. g.* Dr van Bell, "De patefactionis Christianæ indole;" Dr Rauwenhoff, "De justificatione," &c.

*duction to the Books of the Old Testament;* his *Religion of Israel,* &c.; and covered the land with zealous and able disciples of Dr Scholten's school. Even in more orthodox Utrecht, Dr Scholten's book on *The Doctrine of the Reformed Church* found among students in theology earnest attention and warm acceptance. Many of his disciples very soon exceeded their master in boldness and imprudence. While Dr Scholten has never in round words denied the chief points of Jesus' life, some very able followers, occupying foremost positions in the Church, have not hesitated to deny that Jesus rose again on the third day from the grave. While Dr Scholten, though of course denying prayers in the biblical sense of the word, retained the form of prayer in public worship, some of his disciples have given up even that form, and conduct public worship with some few doxologies and confessions. Notwithstanding, the school gained so much influence that the Society for the Defence of Christianity, founded at the Hague in the last quarter of last century, was used under their guidance to defend Scholtenian Christianity against the Christianity of the Bible. Everywhere Scholtenian doctrine was proclaimed in the old orthodox language of prædestination, irresistible grace, and the like, hardly so much employed by the orthodox themselves. Consequently congregations became bewildered at hearing these orthodox terms, mingled now and then with a startling denial of some vital truths. They felt that the whole spirit of the preaching was against the saving Christianity of the Bible, but were in many cases unable to understand the true bearing of what they heard. At the same time, many a disciple of Scholten spoke as if theirs was the only truth, and as if it were puerile presumption for any one who differed from the dictates of the great master at Leyden to lay claim to be heard among the scientific men of the day.

At the side of the Scholtenian school, partly in sympathy with it, and partly in opposition against it, was the influence of Professor Opzoomer and his empirical method, chiefly exercised through his talented disciple Dr Pierson. Following the empiric of the senses, he denied of necessity all miracles, and left at least in his philosophy no place for the spiritual world and its realities. So far did this spirit of rationalistic revolt against God's truth obtain a hold on men's minds, that one of the ablest and most honest members of the extreme left

of Dr Scholten's school—Busken Huët, minister in the French Reformed Church at Harlem—felt that he could not with a good conscience remain a minister in the Reformed Church, and had the courage and honesty to lay down his ministry, when he was without any other means of subsistence.

As might be expected, the Scholtenian system raised a very earnest opposition. The Groningen school found themselves in the embarrassing position of being confronted by a system in which the rationalistic elements of their own school were brought to their logical development with a talent for theological science in which they were to a large extent deficient, while, at the same time, the very centre of their theology—the historical person of Jesus—was reduced to an unnecessary accident. With great earnestness their leaders spoke against Dr Scholten's doctrine. Soon after the publication of his remarkable book, Professor Pareau replied in a work on the Evangelical Construction of the Church; so did Professor Hofstede de Groot in 1859, in a direct answer to Dr Scholten's criticism on the Groningen school, as well as in several articles in *Waarheid in liefde*. But they could not break the force of Dr Scholten's influence. With his unsparing dialectical powers he pursued the Groningen inconsequences, and after not many years, the more advanced part of the Groningen school gradually went over to the Scholtenian ranks. The old leaders continued to occupy their old positions, but no accession of new or telling power was received. The Churches increasingly sought men of more advanced principles, either Scholtenian or orthodox; and the Groningen school gradually lost its hold upon public sympathy, till now it lives only a languishing life.

The smaller Protestant bodies outside the Dutch Reformed Church criticised Dr Scholten's estimate of the characteristics of their communities. The Remonstrants replied through Dr John Tidemann's pamphlet on *The Remonstrants and Remonstrantism;* the Baptists, through Gorter, in an *Inquiry about the Characteristic Principle of the Baptists;* through Visscher, in a letter published in the *Jaarboeken voor Wetenschappelyke Theologie* (VIII. p. 524, ff.); and through Hoekstra, who made afterward a more general attack on Scholten's position in his book on *Moral Liberty*, written in an indeterministic spirit, against which Scholten replied in his

book on the same subject. From the old supranaturalistic point of view, the principles of Scholten were contested in a very able manner by S. G. Jorissen, minister of the Dutch Reformed Church at Utrecht, in his *Remonstrances on the Domain of Theology.* Among the old orthodox, the most notable opposition was made by Groen van Prinsterer in his *Reply to Dr Scholten,* and by Da Costa, who, while perfectly right in denouncing the system of Dr Scholten as hostile to the old Reformation truth, were, on several occasions, nevertheless sharply rebuked by Dr Scholten as being ignorant of and opposed to the true reformed orthodoxy, of which he claimed to be the champion.

Shortly after the publication of Dr Scholten's book, some able men, commonly designated as evangelical or ethical-irenical orthodox, formed a society under the name of "Earnestness and Peace," to which among many others belonged Dr Doedes, Dr van Oosterzee, Dr Beets, minister of the gospel in Utrecht, Chantepie de la Saussaye, minister of the gospel first in the French Reformed Church at Leyden, afterward in the Dutch Reformed Church at Rotterdam, Dr van den Ham, minister of the gospel at Utrecht, Dr Hasebroek, and J. J. van Toorenenberger. Separated from the different shades of the rationalists by their earnest convictions (1) of the reality of the supernatural, more especially of a self-conscious, free, sovereign, triune God, above all and in all, the fundamental character of whose nature is love; (2) of the awful power and guilt of the moral depravity of fallen human nature; and (3) of the truth of God's revelation described in the Bible, of which Christ, true God and true man, is the Alpha and the Omega; of the necessity and sufficiency of the redemption of fallen men by His blood, and their regeneration by the Holy Ghost; in short, of all the essential dogmas of the Reformation of the sixteenth century; they were, on the other side, distinguished from the majority of the orthodox by their not less earnest conviction that the Reformation was not closed in the sixteenth century; that the confessions of the Reformation period, though most excellent, did not contain a final or fully adequate expression of the truth as it is in Jesus; that more especially the great Head of the Church, through the power and prevalence of humanistic perversions of the truth in our time, was directing the attention of His

Church to the thoroughly ethical nature of the truth, which the Church of the sixteenth century, being engaged in a reformation of Roman Catholic errors, had not especially set forth, and was laying it upon her to develop the reformed doctrines from the Holy Scriptures, chiefly in an ethical sense, and to prepare thereby a new method of apologetics, based on the harmony between the truth so developed and the moral nature of man, in order that the power of humanistic unbelief might be conquered, and the Church come forth from her fiery trial blessed with the light and life of a new reformation. In consequence of this difference of principle, there was also a difference between the old orthodox and the evangelical orthodox in their methods of opposition to the school of Scholten. While the more stationary orthodox desired to oppose the Scholtenian school chiefly in the domain of Church-law, on the ground that they had no right to remain in the Dutch Reformed Church, whose fundamental truths they denied; the evangelical orthodox, led by their principles, knowing, moreover, the impossibility during the prevailing rationalistic influence in the higher church courts of excluding rationalists in that way from the Church, and earnestly desiring to avoid a new secession, sought to counteract the Scholtenian influence by exposing and refuting the Scholtenian principles in every way which their position laid open to them. Their leaders, being called in not a few instances to the ministry in the same churches of which leaders of the Scholtenian school were also pastors,[1] opposed the errors of the latter frequently in the same pulpit from which they were proclaimed. Important opposition on scientific grounds was also offered to Dr Scholten's system. Dr van Oosterzee had given an extensive and very condemning critic of Scholten's famous book in the *Jaarboeken voor Wetenschappelyke Theologie* (viii. p. 717, ff). This brought down upon him a reply, in which Dr Scholten not only sought to maintain his doctrines, but with much sharpness attacked the character and tried to destroy the great popularity of Dr van Oosterzee. Chantepie de la Saussaye, in his periodical, *Ernst en Vrede*, has criticised Dr Scholten's system (in an elaborate review of his book on the *Doctrine of the Reformed Church*) as a

[1] In the Dutch Reformed Church, the ministers of the same place have not each his own parish church, but preach in the different churches in turns.

boundless idealism, antagonistic both to the doctrine of the Reformed Church and to the truth as it is in Jesus. Dr Doedes in opening his labours as professor of divinity at Utrecht, exposed and attacked the very root of the deep-going difference which existed between him and Dr Scholten's school, in his inaugural oration on *Modern or Apostolic Christianity.* While J. J. van Toorenenberger, in his able contributions to the explanation, critic, and development of the doctrine of the Reformed Church, and Dr van Oosterzee in his *Theology of the New Testament,* and of late in his *System of Christian Dogmatics,* have set against Dr Scholten's system a more reliable exposition of the truth. All these labours could not quench the influence of Dr Scholten's school, but they have sustained and quickened men's earnest adhesion to apostolic Christianity, with this result, that more and more the religious world in the Netherlands has become divided into two sharply opposed camps, with little in common save the Christian name, and that a love for Biblical Christianity among the people has steadily increased and deepened.

The ecclesiastical courts, being in a large measure composed of friends of the rationalistic tendencies, of course took no action against the new doctrines. On the contrary, the General Synod in 1854 changed the form of subscription required from candidates to the ministry, in a Scholtenian sense. If the form of subscription required since 1816 left it open to be read as binding the future ministers to preach the doctrine contained in the church-symbols, that possibility ceased in the new form. Even the necessity of accepting the Bible as the Word of God was removed. It demanded from the future ministers a declaration that they accepted, in accordance with the principle of the Christian Church in general, and of the Reformed Church in particular, God's holy Word, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; that they were willing to maintain faithfully the spirit and the main point of the doctrine which is contained in the accepted symbols of unity of the Dutch Reformed Church, and therefore will preach the whole counsel of God, especially His grace in Jesus Christ as the only ground of salvation. This form, though in its material principle worded in the seducing terms of a most sound orthodoxy, is nearly literally taken from Dr Scholten's book on the *Doctrine of the Reformed Church.*

And the spirit in which it was drawn up was proved about the same time, on the occasion of the final acquittal of Dr Meyboom and Dr Zaalberg (a moderate disciple of Scholten) from the charge of heresy brought against them before the highest synodal courts. They were discharged, because it was not proved what was the doctrine which the Church courts ought to maintain. This principle was confirmed by the general Synod in 1855. Deliberating on an address from the evangelical orthodox, which protested against the principle on which that acquittal was based, the Synod declared itself incompetent to do anything against that principle. It thus became evident that for all practical purposes an unlimited liberty of ministers to teach what they pleased, was established in the Dutch Reformed Church, and with a corresponding compulsion on the Church to endure (at least with respect to the ecclesiastical courts) the most flagrant heresy in the Church of their fathers.

From henceforth no judicial proceedings against the rationalistic doctrines have been brought before the Church courts. Before it could be done with any hope of success, the Church courts themselves must be changed, and that could not be done without the change of the electing bodies. Hitherto the higher Church courts have been chosen by the lower, and these by the presbyteries ("sessions") of the different places. The presbyteries again elected themselves, with only an opportunity given to the congregation to oppose the choice, of which almost nobody made any use. But the liberal tendencies abroad in the Church and in the State had prepared men's minds to condemn this pernicious oligarchy, and to give Church members a more direct part in the choice of elders and deacons. To this field the orthodox have transferred the contest, and after many sharp struggles, with partial success. There is now a way open to the male church members to influence the choice of the members of the presbyteries, and thereby (since orthodox sympathies prevail among the people), gradually to purify the Church courts and the Church from pernicious rationalistic error.

On the present condition of the Dutch Reformed Church, the writer is unable to give an independent account, by reason of his absence for nearly ten years from the Netherlands. He can only say, that he has the impression that the faithful preach-

ing of the truth, as it is in Jesus, is doing what rationalism cannot do, to satisfy the spiritual wants of the people, and, promoted by the more free election of elders and deacons, has brought on a turn in the tide. The influence of the orthodox is increasing, while the influence of the rationalists decreases. Large numbers of theological students flock to the more orthodox university of Utrecht, giving promise that the spirit of the future ministers will be better than that of the present. The Dutch Reformed Church appears to be in a fair way to afford a fresh proof that the Word of God can still overcome the powers which oppose it, and make believers conquer the audacious and skilful attacks of the most dangerous errors.

A retrospect of the recent history of the Dutch Reformed Church sheds an interesting light on the character and development of rationalistic principles everywhere abroad.

The tendency of these principles is: to honour man more than God; to set the authority of man's reason above the authority of God's revelation; to underestimate, if not to deny, the awful guilt and power of sin; to deprive Christ of His divine glory, and of His saving power by His blood and His Spirit; and to relax men's conscientious respect for earnest moral principle.

The first symptoms of the working of these tendencies in the Dutch Reformed Church before 1835, were: growing indifference respecting the truths of revelation, dislike for earnest dogmatical teaching, attraction to all whatever was new or tended to extol man and his power. They sought to establish and to maintain themselves as long as possible under the cover of ambiguities in the most solemn engagements, ambiguities which in any other sphere would have been abhorred as unworthy of honest or conscientious men. In the Groningen school they took a bolder stand by distinctly denying some of the main truths of revelation. Even there, however, they were mingled with much that had not grown from the same root, chiefly an honest respect for the historical person of our Lord, mystic warmth in preaching, and much practical earnestness. Here they were content to stand alongside of more orthodox truths. In the Scholtenian school, on the contrary, everything was sacrificed to logical consistency. Moral good and evil were made different stages of one and the same development. The dualism between God and the world was in many

respects weakened if not abolished. The fundamental facts of Christianity became of accidental value, even the resurrection of Christ being boldly denied. Here the rationalistic principles were covered with the strongest orthodox terms, and dared with great audacity to give themselves out in the face of the honest friends of truth as genuine historical orthodoxy. On this stage, more honest men like Busken Huët felt constrained to lay down the ministry in the Church, and even one of the most able missionaries of the Missionary Society of Rotterdam—Hartshoorn—principal of a seminary for the preparation of heathen converts to the ministry in the island of Java, gave in his demission, because he no longer believed Christianity to be true.

Standing before such appalling results, well may we feel constrained earnestly to oppose the principles which brought them forth. Since these principles can only prosper where men's experience of the vital powers of the gospel languishes, and the true relation between faith and science, between revelation and reason, between divine authority and human liberty, is misunderstood, let us nurse in our hearts the life with Christ hidden in God, and labour according to our strength and opportunity at the solution of the great problems of our time.

J. G. VAN RYN.

## REPRINTED ARTICLE.

### *Galilee in the Time of Christ.*

I. *Introduction.*—One gets, in general, a very poor impression of Galilee from the allusions made to it in commentaries and sermons. The province is spoken of as having been, in the time of our Lord, one of the most "obscure" and "despised" of the Roman empire; and Nazareth has the misfortune of being represented as then an "insignificant village," whose inhabitants were "ignorant," and even "immoral." Such is, perhaps, the general impression of Galilee; but it is far enough from the truth. The writers of the Gospels invariably speak of Nazareth as a "city" (πόλις), and in no case do they call it a "village" (κώμη); and it is quite probable that its population amounted to fifteen or twenty thousand souls. As to the province itself, it was in Christ's time one of the gardens of the world—well watered, exceedingly fertile, thoroughly cultivated, and covered with a dense population.

The object of this paper is sufficiently indicated by its title. It may be said, however, that the subject could hardly be confined to the dates which bound the life of Christ. We must be allowed to illustrate our subject, to some extent, at least, both by what preceded this period,—say, during the life of Herod the Great,—and by what followed it, even to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Still, our sole object is to set forth Galilee as it was during the life of our Lord.

The work now proposed has never, so far as we are aware, been thoroughly done; and almost the only attempts in this field are those of Hausrath and Keim. But the former is very brief (hardly ten pages); and the latter, although a little fuller (about sixteen pages), does not pretend to exhaust the subject. We have patiently searched in every direction for facts which might illustrate this country at the time when "Jesus went everywhere among its cities and villages, teaching and preaching the gospel of the kingdom." But it will be seen that, instead of putting the statements of the Gospels foremost, we have kept them in reserve, and have sought to

*[By the Rev. SELAH MERRILL, Andover. From The Bibliotheca Sacra of January last.]*

gather from all external sources those facts by which to light up the background against which the statements of the Gospels rest. We give below a brief notice of the principal books which have served us in our labours:

Keim, "Geschichte Jesu von Nazara," 3 vols., Zürich, 1867–1872. Hausrath, "Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte," vol. i. Heidelberg, 1868; vol. ii. ibid. 1872. Neubauer, "La Géographie du Talmud," 1 vol. Paris, 1868. Ritter, "Geography of Palestine," Trans. by W. L. Gage, N.Y., 1870, in 4 vols. Graetz, the 3d vol. of his "Geschichte der Juden," edition of Leipzig, 1856. Lewin, "Fasti Sacri," 1 vol., London, 1865. Schneckenburger, "Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte," 1 vol., Frankfort am Main, 1862. Lutterbeck, "Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe," 2 vols., Mainz, 1852. Gfrörer, the 1st vol. of his "Das Jahrhundert des Heils," Stuttgart, 1838. Renan, "Historie Générale des Langues Sémitiques," 1 vol., Paris, 1863. Arnaud, "La Palestine ancienne et moderne," 1 vol., Paris, 1868. Munk, "Palestine," 1 vol., Paris, 1863. Tobler, "Nazareth," 1 vol., Berlin, 1868. Furst, "Kulter-und Literaturgeschichte der Juden in Asien," 1 vol., Leipzig, 1849. Lightfoot, "Horæ Hebraicæ," edit. Robert Gandell, Oxford, 1859, in 4 vols. Thomson, "The Land and the Book," 1 vol., London, 1869. Porter, "Hand-book for Syria and Palestine;" also his "Giant Cities of Bashan," 1 vol., New York, 1867. Stanley, "Sinai and Palestine," 1 vol., New York, 1870; also his "Jewish Church," 2 vols., New York, 1863 and 1866. Robinson, "Biblical Researches," 2d edit., 3 vols., Boston, 1860. Tristram, "Natural History of the Bible," 1 vol., London, 1868; also his "The Land of Israel; a Journal, etc.," 1 vol., London, 1866. Furrer, "Wanderungen durch Palästina, 1 vol., Zurich, 1865. Smith, "Dictionary of the Bible," Amer. edition. Kitto, "Cyclop. Bib. Lit.," edit. by W. L. Alexander, 3d edition, 3 vols., 1866. Milman, "History of the Jews, 3 vols., London, 1866. Weber and Holtzmann, "Geschichte des Volkes Israel," 2 vols., Leipzig, 1867. Herzfeld, "Geschichte des Volkes Israel," 3 vols., Braunschweig, 1847 sq. Jost, "Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten," 3 vols., Leipzig, 1857 sq.; also the 2d vol. of his "Gesch. der Israeliten," edit. Berlin, 1821. Ewald, "History of Israel," Eng. trans., London, 1869 sq. Madden, "Jewish Coinage," 1 vol. London, 1864. Derenbourg, "Histoire de la Palestine, d'après des Thalmuds et les autres sources Rabbiniques," 1 vol., Paris, 1867. Schwarz, "Das heilige Land," 1 vol., Frankfort am Main, 1852. Delitzsch, "Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu," Erlangen, 1868; also his "Jesus und Hillel," ibid. 1867. Conybeare and Howson, "Life and Epistles of St Paul," 2 vols. in 1, New York, 1869. Palestine Exploration Fund, "The Recovery of Jerusalem," 1 vol., New York, 1871; also by the same, "Our Work in Palestine," 1 vol., New York, 1873. Geiger, "Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel," 1 vol., Breslau, 1857. Von Raumer, "Palästina," 1 vol., Leipzig, 1835. Graetz, "Sinai et Golgotha ou les origines du Judaisme et du Christianisme," 1 vol., Paris, 1867. Rawlinson, "Ancient Monarchies," 3 vols., New York, 1871. Josephus,

edit. Dindorf, pub. Didot, 2 vols., Paris, 1845, 1847; Trans. of "Antiquities," by Whiston; Trans. of the "Wars" by Traill, edited by Isaac Taylor, 2 vols., London, 1851. Buxtorf, "Lex. Chald. Tal. et Rab.," new edit., by Fischer. Chiarini, "Le Talmud," etc., 2 vols., Leipzig, 1831. Merivale, "History of the Romans under the Empire," 7 vols., New York, 1871. Renan, "Life of Jesus," Eng. trans., 1 vol., New York, 1871. Jahn, "Bib. Archæology," 3d edit., 1 vol., Andover, 1832. Kenrick, "Phœnicia," 1 vol., London, 1855. Capts. Burton and Drake, "Unexplored Syria," 2 vols., London, 1872. Van de Velde, "Syria and Palestine," 2 vols., London, 1854. Williams, "Holy City," 2 vols., London, 1849. Wilson, "Lands of the Bible," 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1847.

Several other important works have been used, which will be referred to in the proper place. We would refer to the notes of Isaac Taylor, in his edition of Traill's Josephus's "Wars," as very valuable. The little work of Schneckenburger is very comprehensive and clear. Lewin's work is of great value. Neubauer's "Géographie" has been of great service to us. Dr J. Morgenstern published, in 1870 (two pamphlets, Berlin, 1870), a severe review of it,[1] which review we have used in connection with Neubauer's work. On the other hand, Dr M. A. Levy, in the "Zeitschrift der D. M. Gesellschaft," 1869, p. 699, and Dr Geiger, in the "Judische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben," 1869, p. 62 sq., both praise Neubauer's "Géographie," as a work of great merit. Hausrath is always fresh and suggestive. We can, with much justice, call him the German Stanley. Keim's is a vast work; it is characterised by fulness and richness. We feel that both Keim and Delitzsch come to their conclusions, in some cases, without having examined thoroughly the evidence. But in regard to one-sided statements and hasty conclusions, Grætz is unsurpassed. His "Geschichte" is a work of great value; but he often becomes the ill-tempered partisan, rather than remains always the impartial historian. His conclusions have in many cases to be re-examined as to their evidence before they can be received as fact.

II. *How the Country was Governed from* B.C. 47 *to* A.D. 66.—A brief outline is needed of the manner in which Palestine was governed during our period. In B.C. 47, Herod was appointed by his father, Antipater, military governor of Galilee, and his brother Phasaëlus military governor of Judea. In B.C. 41, Phasaëlus and Herod are appointed by Antony tetrarchs of Judea (*i.e.*, of the whole province). In B.C. 40, Phasaëlus is taken prisoner by the Parthians, and kills himself. The same year Herod is declared king of Judea by the Roman senate. In B.C. 37 he becomes master of his kingdom, and enters upon his reign. He died in Jericho, April 1, in B.C. 4, at the age of seventy. The same year Archelaus, Herod's son, is appointed

[1] Die französische Academie und die "Géographie des Talmuds."

by Augustus ethnarch of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea. At the same time Augustus appoints Herod Antipas, Archelaus's brother, tetrarch of Peræa and Galilee, and Herod Philip, half-brother of Archelaus and Antipas, tetrarch of Batanæa, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Paneas, and Gaulanitis.[1] In A.D. 6, Archelaus is banished by Augustus, and Judea comes directly under the Romans. In A.D. 33, Herod Philip dies, and is buried in the eastern Bethsaida. In A.D. 39, Herod Antipas is banished, his wife Herodias going with him into exile. In A.D. 37, Herod Agrippa I., grandson of Herod the Great, is by Caligula made "king" of Trachonitis, *i.e.* of the region which had been Herod Philip's tetrarchy.[2] In A.D. 41, Claudius added to his dominions Judea and Samaria, with Abilene, *i.e.* the tetrarchy of Lysanius, and the parts about Libanus. In A.D. 44, King Agrippa persecutes the Christians, and beheads James, the brother of John, and arrests Peter. The same year Agrippa dies in a strange manner at Cæsarea; has been king of Judea from A.D. 41–44. Judea comes again directly under the Romans. In A.D. 53, Agrippa II., son of the former, is by Claudius made "king" of Herod Philip's tetrarchy (Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulanitis, Batanæa, and Abilene).[3] In A.D. 55, Agrippa II. receives from Nero, in addition to his present dominions, the cities of Tiberias and Tarichæa in Galilee, and Julias and fourteen villages about the latter, and Abilia in Peræa.[4] In A.D. 60, he hears Paul's defence at Cæsarea. He helps Vespasian in the Jewish war. *Points of importance are:*—1. That Herod Antipas was the only civil ruler to whom Christ was subject. 2. The very long reign of Herod Antipas. 3. The long reign of the mild and prosperous ruler, Herod Philip. 4. That Judea from A.D. 6 to A.D. 66, the time of the revolution, was governed by Roman officials, with the exception of from A.D. 41 to A.D. 44, when Herod Agrippa I. was king. The fact that Judea was thus governed will hereafter be seen to be of great importance in estimating the contrast of affairs there and in Galilee.

[1] Lewin, p. 130, No. 950. [2] Ibid. p. 261, No. 1561.
[3] Ibid. p. 229, No. 1788. [4] Wars ii. 13. 2; Ant. xx. 8. 4.

NOTE.—"Ant.," "Wars," "Life," or simply "L.," signify in the following notes respectively Josephus's "Antiquities of the Jews," "Jewish Wars," and his own "Life."

III. *On the Names "Galilee," and "Galilee of the Gentiles."*—It does not belong to the limits of the present Article to show how this province came to be called *Galilee*. The origin of the word is obscure. The meaning of the phrase in Isa. ix. 1, "Galilee of the nations, or Gentiles," is by no means a settled question. Jahn is quite wrong in identifying "Galilee of the Gentiles" with "upper Galilee."[1] The location of the twenty cities given by Solomon to Hiram is also unknown. Ewald calls these cities "small,"[2] and Ritter "small and unimportant places probably,"[3] whereas the Hebrew gives no hint of that kind whatever. In our opinion they were heathen cities subject to Solomon; for Solomon would hardly have given away twenty cities occupied by Jewish people, unless he had been brought into great financial straits, which was not the case. We also claim that the cities of both upper and lower Galilee, with a very few exceptions, were occupied by a Jewish population.

IV. *Extent of Galilee, and the number of Inhabitants to a Square Mile.*—Galilee embraced the northern portion of the country west of the Jordan, covering in the main the territory of the four tribes, Asher, Naphtali, Zebulon, and Issachar. The boundary of these tribes are given definitely enough in Josh. xix., but it is impossible to trace them now, because the places mentioned as marking the boundaries have not, with very few exceptions, been identified. For the same reason the boundary line of this province, so explicitly laid down by Josephus,[4] is lost to us, as well as the line dividing between what in his day were known as "Upper" and "Lower" Galilee. At the division of the country among the four tribes just mentioned, there were in all sixty-nine cities mentioned by name.[5] For the most part their sites are unknown. In

[1] Bib. Arch. Sec. 25. p. 31. [2] iii. 292.

[3] iv. 334. The "Cabul" of Hiram, as to the use he makes of it, has never been satisfactorily explained. 1 Kings ix. 13: Explanations may be found in the lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst, also in Joseph. Ant. viii. 5. 3, and in Ewald iii. 292; Ewald rejects altogether that of Josephus. For a reason why Solomon gave these cities to Hiram, see Ewald iii. 292. In connection with Isa. ix. 1, the passage in 1 Mac. v. 15 seq., should be compared. On the name "Galilee," see Keim, i. 308.

[4] Wars, iii. 3. 1.

[5] Even more than 69 are mentioned; see careful account in Arnaud., 178–183.

Josephus's time this province numbered two hundred and four cities and villages.[1] Of these Josephus mentions about forty by name. Of this forty not more than ten can be located with any degree of certainty; perhaps as many more could be located approximately; the rest remain unidentified.[2] The very best maps of Galilee err in trying to tell more than is absolutely known of that country. The general outline of the province may be indicated; but who at the present stage of research in regard to that country is able to locate the sixty-nine cities of Joshua, or the forty cities and villages of Josephus? This whole province awaits a careful exploration, and the field is beyond doubt a rich one for research. For instance, in Upper Galilee sixteen of the nineteen cities of Naphtali were "fortified."[3] What relics, in the way of foundation stones, are still waiting to be brought to light on the hill-summits of Naphtali! Ritter calls this region "a true *terra incognita*."[4] Fortunately the object we now have in view can be accomplished without knowing definitely the sites of those cities and towns which once made this province a centre of life and prosperity.

During the period under consideration the limits of Galilee may have varied somewhat with the changes in its own and neighbouring rulers. Carmel once belonged to Galilee, but in Josephus's time it was under the control of the Tyrians.[5] The Lake and the river Jordan may at one time have formed the eastern boundary,[6] but the Talmud reckons Gamala and Cesarea Philippi, and also the region above Gadara as belonging to Galilee;[7] and Graetz finds a passage which makes Jotapata and Gischala mark the northern boundary:[8] and Lightfoot gives some very good reasons why Peraea, or a portion of it, might in Christ's time have been included under the general name of "Galilee."[9] The Talmud divides Galilee into upper and lower; but has also a division peculiar to itself, namely, the highland or mountainous region, where the sycamore did not grow; the plain country (Lower Galilee), where the sycamore flourished, and the valley, or the region of Tiberias.[10]

[1] Life, 45. [2] Traill's Jos. ii. p. cxvii. [3] שְׁרֵי מִבְצָר Josh. xix. 35.
[4] iv. 335, 377. [5] Wars iii. 3. 1; Ritter, iv. 341.
[6] Reland, i. 181. [7] Neubauer, 178, 236, 242.
[8] iii. 393; Tal. Gittin, 7. b. [9] i. 295 *et seq.*
[10] Neubauer, 59, 62, 63, 178, and his references to Talmud; Lightfoot, i. 336.

Where the boundaries remain so indefinite it is impossible, of course, to give the exact extent of its territory. The whole territory of Palestine, including that of the trans-Jordanic tribes, is estimated at about 11,000 square miles.[1] Of the territory west of the Jordan, it is safe to say that Galilee occupied about one-third—perhaps a small third. Mr Phillott's estimate is without doubt altogether too low, who allows only 930 square miles to Galilee. On the other hand, Keim's estimate may be too high, who allows to it about 2000 square miles. Grove makes about 6600 square miles west of the Jordan,[2] while Stanley makes of the same territory about 9000 square miles.[3] If Stanley is right, Galilee can easily have had 2000 square miles, and even more. But how to crowd three million people or more into such a space, and have them supported? It may not have been such a difficult problem; we judge perhaps too much according to our modern ideas of *room* and *expensive living*. For instance, about the sea of Galilee, thirteen miles by seven being the size of the sea, there was a complete nest of cities, ten and perhaps twelve flourishing cities. In 1849 Malta had a population of 1182 to the square mile. The county of Lancashire, England, had 1064, and that of Middlesex 6683 inhabitants to the square mile. The island of Barbadoes, with an area of about 166 square miles, without any large towns, without manufactures of any description, a purely agricultural colony, supports a population of 180,000 souls, or over 1084 to the square mile. Considering the many large cities of Galilee, its 3,000,000 inhabitants may easily have been supported on its 2000 square miles.[4]

V. *Galilee a Region of Great Natural Fertility and Richness.*—The province to which our attention is now called, was by no means the least favoured, nor the least important portion of the Holy Land. On account of its astonishing fruitfulness, its many resources, and its hardy population, it ranked next

[1] Smith's Bib. Dict. i. 405, col. 1. Art. "Census"; see Keim i. 311.

[2] Smith's Bib. Dict. iii. 2286, col. 2.

[3] S. and P. 114. Grove, 140 miles from Dan to Beersheba, and 40 miles average width from the Jordan to the Mediterranean. Stanley 180 miles by 50 miles. Stanley, however, does not make the *average* breadth 50 miles, but "its breadth is *rarely more* than 50 miles."

[4] Graetz, iii. 391, allows about 1800 square miles; Kitto's Cyclop. Bib. Lit. ii. 56, about 1250; Jahn, Bib. Arch. p. 25, sec. 22, about 1200.

to Jerusalem in importance; "it was the bulwark of Jerusalem."[1] The Gospels, in those portions of them which relate to Galilee, place us in an exceedingly fertile region, whose surface was covered with "cities and villages," which were crowded with a dense population, and full of energy and life.[2] Most travellers in that country, and those writers who have studied its physical characteristics, represent it as being of great natural fertility and beauty, remarkably diversified by mountain and hill, valley and plain, springs, rivers, and lakes, while its climate is "the nearest possible approach to a perpetual spring."[3] Josephus, Tacitus, the Babylonian Talmud (A.D. 500), Antoninus Martyr (A.D. 600), and almost any number since the time of the latter, have been unanimous in praising the natural beauties and resources of Galilee. Here is "the most fertile soil in all Palestine."[4] To one its beautiful Lake is "the eye of Galilee."[5] The Rabbis compared the Lake to "gliding waters."[6] "The shores of Tiberias formed one of the gardens of the world."[7] To one the plain of Gennesareth is "the unparalleled garden of God."[8] "The land of Naphtali is everywhere covered with fruitful fields and vines; and the fruits of this region are renowned for their wonderful sweetness."[9] "If nature could influence mind, if it could create genius, Naphtali would be the land of poets."[10] The Rabbis testify that the shores of the Lake were "covered with cities, villages, and market-places."[11] "For sixteen miles about Sepphoris the region was fertile, flowing with milk and honey."[12] "Galilee is a land of water-brooks, abounding in timber, fertile, and beautiful."[13] The words of the dying lawgiver in regard to the four tribes which settled in this section, lead us to expect that they were to occcupy a region of great richness and beauty, or, in other words, applying to the territory what was said of the people, "a land full of the blessing of Jehovah."[14] All that we know of the country since con-

[1] Graetz, iii. 391. [2] Hausrath, i. 8. [3] Ritter, ii. 240.
[4] Jost, Gesch. der Israel, i. 34 (Berlin ed. 1820). [5] Hausrath, i. 4.
[6] Lightfoot, i. 143. [7] Ritter, ii. 240.
[8] Keim, i. 311. [9] Neubauer, 180, and refs. to Talmud.
[10] Porter, Cities of Bashan, 263.
[11] Neubauer, 185, and refs. to Talmud; Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 15, "Amoenis circumseptum oppidis."
[12] Neubauer, 192, and refs. to Talmud.
[13] Rawlinson, Monarchies (ed. in 3 vols.), ii. 448. [14] Deut. xxxiii. 23.

firms the impression given by Moses. Renan, with glowing language, speaks of this region as "a country very green, and full of shade and pleasantness, the true country of the Canticle of Canticles, and of the songs of the well-beloved."[1] We must make room for the statement of Josephus, who, as military governor of the province, knew thoroughly its characteristics and resources. Of the country in general: "It is throughout rich in soil and pasturage, producing every variety of tree, and inviting by its productiveness even those who have the least inclination for agriculture; it is everywhere tilled, no part allowed to lie idle, and is everywhere productive."[2] And of the plain of Gennesareth he speaks as "admirable both for its natural properties and its beauty."[3] "Such is the fertility of the soil that it rejects no plant, and accordingly all are here cultivated by the husbandman; for so genial is the air that it suits every variety The walnut, which delights beyond other trees in a wintry climate, grows here luxuriantly, together with the palm-tree, which is nourished by heat; and near to those are figs and olives, to which a milder atmosphere has been assigned. One might style this an ambitious effort of Nature, doing violence to herself in bringing together plants of discordant habits, and an admirable rivalry of the seasons, each, as it were, asserting her right to the soil: for it not only possesses the extraordinary virtue of nourishing fruits of opposite climes, but also maintains a continual supply of them. Thus it produces those most royal of all, the grape and the fig, during ten months, without intermission, while the other varieties ripen the year round." Then he goes on to speak of "the genial temperature of the air," the plain being "irrigated by a highly fertilising spring," and of the fish similar to those found in the lake of Alexandria.[4]

There can be no doubt that this land had been infinitely favoured by nature. The Hebrew phrase, "a land flowing with milk and honey," might best express the exceeding fertility and richness of Galilee at the time of Christ. The capabilities of the soil were perhaps fully developed by skilful labour.[5] The industrious farmers devoted their chief attention to the crops best adapted to their soil, and which at the same time found the readiest market; hence, in many cases,

[1] Life of Jesus, 96 (Eng. tr.). [2] Wars, iii. 3. 2, 3. [3] Ibid. iii. 10. 8.
[4] Wars, iii. 10. 8. [5] Graetz, iii. 391.

meadow and pasture-land were turned into tillage, because the cultivation of grain and fruits was found to be more profitable than the raising of cattle.[1] The rich fields were sometimes so parcelled out that the plough could no longer be used, and the soil must be turned up with the spade. Yet in the open fields where the plough was used, the workmen prided themselves on being able to turn and lay a furrow with skill,[2] which would never have been attempted in the stony fields of Judea. With such a soil, and under such a cultivation, it is not surprising that the country became a paradise in beauty.[3] All the trees and fruits of Palestine flourished here to perfection. It was even asked why the fruits of Gennesareth were not found in Jerusalem at the time of the feasts? and reply was made, "so that no one may be tempted to come to the feasts merely for the sake of enjoying those fruits."[4] Here were found all the productions which made Italy rich and beautiful, with the additional advantage that here also "the palm and the balm tree flourished in great luxuriance;" in the eyes of the Romans "these palm groves were beautiful and lofty."[5] In a word, forests in many cases covered its mountains and hills,[6] while its uplands, gentle slopes, and broader valleys, were rich in pastures, meadows, cultivated fields, vineyards, olive-groves, and fruit-trees of every kind. Here in this "garden that has no end," flourished the vine, the olive, and the fig, the oak, the hardy walnut, the terebinth, and the hot-blooded palm, the cedar, cypress, and balsam, the fir-tree, the pine, and sycamore, the bay-tree, the myrtle, the almond, the pomegranate, the citron, and the beautiful oleander. These, with still many other forest, fruit, and flowering trees, and shrubs, and aromatic plants, together with grains and fruits, to which should be added an infinite profusion of flowers, made up

[1] Hausrath, i. 8.

[2] Hausrath, i. 352; Luke ix. 62; see Luke xvi. 3.

[3] Graetz, iii. 381; Tobler, Nazareth, 19.

[4] Lightfoot, i. 155; Neubauer, 45, and refs. to Talmud. In Solomon's time this region supplied many of the luxuries for the table and palace of the king, 1 Kings iv. 12; Ritter, iv. 339. See Ewald, iii. 295.

[5] Tac. Hist. v. 6.

[6] See hills about Jotapata, Wars, iii. 7, 8. At the time of the invasion under Joshua, "the mountains of Gilboa and the country adjacent were covered with dense forests," Ritter, ii. 328; Van de Velde, i. 293.

that wonderful variety of natural productions which adorned and enriched the region where was the home of Jesus.[1]

VI. *The Waters of Galilee.*—Galilee was a well-watered country. The words of promise spoken to the Hebrews in regard to the land which they were to enter, "a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths springing from valleys and hills,"[2] would be truer of Galilee than of any other section. The lakes of this province, with their blue transparent waters, contribute not a little to the charming beauty of the landscapes.[3] The water of lake Merom is sweet,[4] as is also that of lake Tiberias, and crystal clear.[5] The Rabbis find it difficult to praise enough their beautiful lake, which was justly the pride of their whole land. They speak of its "gracefully flowing" or "gliding waters."[6] Jehovah, they said, had created seven seas, and of these he had chosen the sea of Gennesareth as his special delight.[7] The Jordan, the only stream in Palestine deserving the name of "river," with its "sources," its "floods," and its remarkably winding course, belonged, at least in its upper and finer half, to Galilee. Perhaps the Litany, where it bends from a southerly to a westerly course, touched upon the northern frontier of this province. Here belonged the Kishon, the famous "river of

[1] Tobler, Nazareth, 34; von Raumer, 105; Stanley, S. and P. 357; Hausrath, i. 4, 5; Tristram, Nat. Hist. Bib. 10, and elsewhere; Tobler, Nazareth, 14, *et seq.* for present productions: indigo, rice, and sugar-cane, Ritter, ii. 241; barley, millet, pulse, oranges, and even that civilising weed, tobacco! Keim, i. 601. See the excellent and careful account of the shrubs, grains, and fruits, &c., in Arnaud, 341–362: pear, apricot, cherry, mulberry, &c. Tristram, Nat. Hist. Bib. 335.

NOTE.—In connection with the physical features of Galilee, we might mention the plains and marshes above and around Lake Merom, where wild animals abounded, and which formed, perhaps, the best hunting ground in the country. Herod the Great was celebrated as a hunter. Hausrath, i. 4, 351. Herod hunting, Ant., xv. 7. 7; xvi. 8. 4; xvi. 10. 3. See xvi. 11. 8. Wars, i. 26. 2. On the *game* of Palestine, and Herod's skill as a hunter, see especially Wars, i. 21. 13.

[2] Deut. viii. 7. [3] Ritter, iii. 200. [4] Graetz, iii. 391.

[5] Keim, i. 600; Wars, iii. 10. 7. [6] Lightfoot, i. 143.

[7] On the seven seas of Palestine, see Neubauer, 24, who gives names, details, and references. Lightfoot, i. 12. In the view of the Christian, in a far higher sense than was thought of by the Rabbis, God has indeed chosen the sea of Galilee, and blessed it beyond all other seas of the earth, Hausrath, i. 350. On the depth of the lake, see Ritter, ii. 237: "One hundred and twenty to one hundred and fifty-six feet."

battle," called in the song of Deborah and Barak "that ancient river."[1] It took its rise near the foot of Tabor, went a winding course across the plain of Esdraelon, and entered the bay of Acre near the foot of Carmel. A principal feeder of this stream came from Gilboa and Engannim. It received "the waters of Megiddo" not far from the town of the same name. When the Kishon was at its height, it would be, partly on account of its quicksands, as impassable as the ocean itself to a retreating army.[2] The river Belus should also be mentioned, which entered the sea near Acre, and from the fine sand of whose bed the Phoenicians, according to tradition, first made glass.[3] "No less than four springs pour forth their almost full-grown rivers through the plain" of Gennesareth.[4] "Beautiful springs, characteristic of the whole valley of the Jordan, are unusually numerous and copious along the western shore of the lake."[5] Half an hour north of the town of Tiberias are five or six profuse springs lying near together, and called the "cool fountains," to distinguish them from the hot ones south of the city.[6] Ritter speaks of "the hundred brooks" that distribute their waters through the neighbourhood of Banias, "carrying fertility everywhere."[7] Thomson speaks of "the ample supply of water" about Ayun.[8] Six streams have been counted flowing into lake Huleh from the mountains lying west of it,—the largest of which is from forty to fifty feet wide.[9] Then the abundance of dew which falls about Tabor, remarked by Burckhardt, Robinson, and others, was of the utmost importance to vegetation in that immediate neighbourhood.[10] The "dew of Hermon" was long ago praised,[11] and the rich vegetation of the surrounding region is due to this fructifying influence.[12] The perpetual snow on Hermon proved no doubt an infinite blessing to the people of this province, freshening the atmosphere by day, and cooling

[1] Judg. v. 21. [2] Van de Velde, i. 289.

[3] In Josh. xix. 26, appears the name שִׁיחוֹר לִבְנָת which has often been identified with the river Belus, Arnaud, 251, 252, and references. Fürst's Lexicon under these words. Mr Grove, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, iv. 2996, col. 2, doubts the identity, and doubts even if "Shichor Libnath" refers to any river at all.

[4] Stanley, S. and P. 366. [5] Ibid. [6] Ritter, ii. 262.

[7] Ibid. ii. 192. [8] Heb. Ijon? 225. [9] Ritter, ii. 210.

[10] Ibid. ii. 318. [11] Ps. cxxxiii. 3.

[12] See a glowing description of this in Van de Velde, i. 127.

it by night.[1] The snow was even carried to Tyre, Sidon, and Damascus as a luxury, and labourers sweltering in the hot harvest fields used it to cool the water which they drank.[2] No doubt Herod Antipas at his feasts in Tiberias enjoyed also from this very source the modern luxury of ice-water! The warm springs of this province are also to be noticed: at Biram, Gadara, and Tiberias, of which those at the latter place were most renowned. "These three springs," the Rabbis say, "remained after the deluge."[3] There is a large cluster of these springs near Tiberias. Some of them are hot, and are called by the Rabbis "the boiling waters."[4] The supply of water in the largest is sufficient to turn the wheels of mills.[5] Pliny speaks of the "healthfulness"[6] of these springs, and so does Josephus.[7] These springs were the "watering places" of that age and country, the delightful resort of people of means, and were visited also with great benefit by the feeble or sick of the land, on account of the healing properties of the waters. People were attracted hither from Jerusalem and all other parts of the land, and no doubt the city of Tiberias was increased greatly both in size and importance by this means.[8] In the glens of the north, Porter speaks of "tiny streams murmuring among rocks."[9] If we think of the numberless brooks and mountain torrents, the springs, besides the warm ones already mentioned, the reservoirs, the aqueducts and watercourses,[10] the fountains, the cisterns, and the wells, we have a land in which there was no lack of water, and one infinitely blessed in this respect above Judea.[11]

[1] Tacitus's History, v. 6; Ritter, ii. 18; see p. 181.

[2] Prov. xxv. 13; Robinson, ii. 440; Ritter, ii. 188.

[3] Neubauer, 34, 35. Perhaps Biram should be put down by the Dead Sea, Neubauer, 36, 37; Graetz, iii. 392; Arnaud, 258; Stanley, S. and P. 366; Ritter, ii. 246, *seq.*

[4] Neubauer, as above.

[5] Ritter, ii. 246, from Burckhardt. On the temperature of these springs, see Ritter, ii. 247, 248.

[6] Hist. Nat. v. 15.

[7] L. xvi. On the Warm Springs, see chapter in Lightfoot, i. 150, 151.

[8] Neubauer, 212.

[9] Bashan, 262.

[10] Remains of watercourses or aqueducts about the plain of Gennesareth Our Work in Palestine, 207; Recovery of Jerusalem, 272.

[11] Arnaud, chap. ii., "Eaux de la Palestine," 233-268.

NOTE 1.—Capt. Wilson, Recovery of Jerusalem, 264, gives the size of the Sea of Galilee as twelve and one-fourth miles long, by six and three-fourths "greatest width."

NOTE 2.—For details in regard to these Warm Springs at Tiberias, temperature, &c., see "Recovery of Jerusalem," 282.

VII. *The Plain of Gennesareth.*—Some special notice ought to be taken of the plain of Gennesareth, perhaps in fertility and beauty the gem of the East, as it certainly was the gem of Palestine.[1] We have already quoted Josephus's description of it.[2] It must not be thought of as of great extent. Two miles and a-half long by one broad is all that is allowed to it by the latest explorers.[3] Here nature had lavished her tropical profusion and glory.[4] Trees retained their foilage throughout the whole year, and during ten months of the year grapes and figs ripened. Here, in this rank soil, grew the finest wheat of the land.[5] Its superior and delicious fruits were not found at Jerusalem at the feasts, lest, as we have seen, some persons might attend them for the sake of enjoying these fruits alone.[6] Its climate was a "harmonious mingling of the seasons,"[7] and the Rabbis looked upon this plain as an earthly paradise.[8] And to make the name "Genesareth" suggestive of the richness of the soil, or of the sweetness of its fruits, several fanciful interpretations were adopted.

VIII. *Agricultural Productions and Manufactures*—(1) *Oil.*—Of the productions of this province, fish, wine, wheat, and oil occupy a foremost place. On account of the fine quality and great abundance of the latter, as well as because it was an important article of commerce with other nations, this product

[1] Keim, i. 598.

[2] Wars, iii. 10. 8.

[3] Capt. Wilson, in "Recovery of Jerusalem," 264. Josephus makes it thirty stadia long by twenty broad, Wars, iii. 10. 8; Porter, Hand-book, "three miles long by one mile broad;" Stanley, S. and P. 366, "five miles wide by six or seven long."

[4] Ritter, ii. 241. "The complete glory of southern clime," Hausrath, i. 4.

[5] Grætz, iii. 392.

[6] Neubauer, 45, and references.

[7] Ritter, ii. 240, a phrase borrowed from Hippocrates.

[8] Hausrath, i. 4; Grætz, iii. 392; Arnaud, 241. "The soil consists of a black loam formed by the mingling of decomposed basalt with the alluvium of the Lake," Ritter, ii. 268. "The beach is pearly white with myriads of minute shells,"—Our Work in Palestine, 184. Keim i. 311, calls this the "unparalleled garden of God." The name "Gennesareth" has been referred to כִּנּוֹר, a harp, "its fruit is sweet as the sound of a harp." Others refer it to גַּן garden, and שַׂר prince, "garden of princes." Others to גַּן garden and עָשָׁר riches, "a garden rich in fertility and productions." "This last explanation is very forced," Neubauer, 215; Stanley, S. and P. 366 note. See Keim, i. 598 note, where is given Titus's very high estimation of this lake and region. Attention need hardly be called to the infinite contrast between this region in Christ's time and now; but see Ritter, ii. 253. See Hausrath, i. 350, 351.

deserves special notice. The dying lawgiver said of Asher: "He shall dip his foot in oil."[1] In allusion to this phrase the Rabbis said: "In Asher oil flows like a river."[2] "It is easier," they said, "to raise a legion (*i.e.* a forest) of olive-trees in Galilee, than to raise one child in Judea."[3] Gischala was renowned for the abundance of its oil. Once, when oil was wanted at Laodicea, men were sent to Jerusalem and to Tyre to purchase; but the quantity desired could be found only in Gischala in Galilee.[4] While Asher produced the most oil, Tekoa produced the best. Tekoa was called the *alpha* for oil, while Gischala occupied the third place in the country in regard to the quantity and quality of oil produced.[5] Both Syrians and Phœnicians drew their supplies from this province, and the traffic in this commodity alone proved a source of wealth to the Galileans.[6] Attention is called to a certain period when oil was ten times as dear at Cesarea as at Gischala.[7] Josephus shows that both demand and supply were great, the selling price high, and the revenue large. Of the business at Gischala, John, the rival of Josephus, once had a monopoly.[8] In the villages and towns of Upper Galilee great quantities of oil were stored.[9] It was so abundant in Jotapata that it was used freely as a means of defence when that place was besieged. Large quantities of it were heated and poured down on all sides upon the Romans, which soon scattered their ranks. Their troops, scalded, rolled headlong from the ramparts in excruciating agony.[10] By looking back to the days of Solomon, we may get a hint as to the productiveness of this country, in the amount of agricultural products which this king furnished to Hiram as a yearly tribute. This fact shows what Solomon's country was rich in, and what Hiram needed. Besides immense quantities of wine, wheat, and barley, about two hundred thousand gallons of the best

[1] Deut. xxxiii. 24.

[2] Neubauer, 180, and refs. to authorities.

[3] Neubauer, 180.

[4] Neubauer, 230, and refs. to authorities.

[5] Neubauer, 129, and refs.; 131, and refs.

[6] Wars, ii. 21. 2; Keim, i. 312; Grætz, iii. 392.

[7] L. 13; Traill's Joseph. ii. p. cxxxviii.; Wars, ii. 21. 2 (does Josephus mean Cesarea Philippi?).

[8] Wars, ii. 21. 2. [9] Life, 13.

[10] Wars, iii. 7. 28, where further particulars are given, shewing that this was a terrible, as well as effective, means of defence.

oil were sent to Hiram every year.[1] In Christ's time oil was a common article in the treatment of the sick. Herod the Great, in his last sickness, was almost killed by being plunged into a vessel of oil.[2]

(2.) *Certain Places noted for Particular Productions or Manufactured Articles.*—Our limits do not allow us to speak of the grain production and other industries of this province in detail. We can only pass hastily in review the different places, and speak of the manufactured articles or agricultural and other productions for which each was celebrated. If the evidence on these points which we derive from the Talmud does not all refer to the time of Christ, or the first century (which cannot easily be decided), it shews, at least, that in contrast with Judea, Galilee had infinitely the advantage in regard to agricultural products and industries of all kinds. The figs and grapes and other fruits of the plain of Gennesareth had a national reputation for their superior quality.[3] The very name Gischala (*gush chaleb*, "fat soil") suggested the richness of that region.[4] The people living there were mostly farmers.[5] The region about Safed was noted for its fertility,[6] as was also that about Banias.[7] A portion of this northern district is still celebrated for its excellent wheat.[8]

[1] 1 Kings v. 11 [Heb. vs. 25]; perhaps 2 Chron. ii. 10 [Heb. vs. 9] should be taken as the correct statement. See Thenius's Comment.; Ewald's Hist. Israel, iii. 292.

[2] Wars, i. 33. 5; Mark vi. 13, which applies to Galilee; see Luke x. 34; Herod, Ant. xvii. 6. 5.

NOTE 1.—In the affair of John's monopolising the oil trade of Gischala which Josephus condemns, Graetz takes decidedly the part of the former against the latter. Indeed Graetz is throughout a bitter opponent of Josephus; see Graetz iii. 397. On p. 392, Graetz says that the Galileans sold to the Phœnicians and Syrians their surplus oil, and received therefrom a large revenue. On p. 394, he says that the Galileans *did not* sell their surplus oil to their heathen neighbours, because it was forbidden to transport the means of life—oil and wine—out of the Jewish country.

NOTE 2.—The theory has been put forth by some and stoutly maintained that Christ was an Essene. But Christ commended the use of oil in sickness, in anointing the body, and in every way according to the customs of the time: while the Essenes renounced the use of oil altogether. "They consider oil defiling; and should any one accidentally come into contact with it, he wipes his body," Wars, ii. 8. 3. Such a fact goes far towards settling the question that Christ was not an Essene.

[3] Wars, iii. 10. 8.

[4] Keim, i. 312.

[5] Graetz, iii. 418; Wars, iv. 2. 1, 2.

[6] Ritter, ii. 220, 221.

[7] Ritter, ii. 192.

[8] Ritter, ii. 213.

Notice is taken of the fact that in this province but few small cattle were raised (*i.e.* sheep and goats), because the rich land could be put to a more profitable use. These, however, were raised in abundance in the waste regions of Judea and Syria.[1] The heavy soil of the plain of Jezreel produced superior grain, which was fully equalled by that which grew in the fertile fields of Gennesareth.[2] The wheat of Chorazin and Capernaum was widely celebrated.[3] Bethshean, on account of its fertility, was called the gate of Paradise.[4] The Rabbis boast of the olives of this place, and also of the fine and coarse linen garments which were there manufactured.[5] Safed was celebrated for its honey;[6] Shikmonah for its pomegranates;[7] Achabara for the raising of pheasants.[8] Sigona furnished the best wine.[9] The region about Sepphoris was noted for the production of grain and fruit.[10] Rabbi Jose, who lived in Galilee, said: "For sixteen miles on either side of Sepphoris there flows milk and honey."[11] Large quantities of grain were stored in the towns of Upper Galilee, probably the tribute which belonged to the Roman emperor.[12] The same was true of other places.[13] Grain merchants congregated at Arabah.[14] In the siege of Jotapata there was no lack "of all kinds of provisions, except salt and water."[15] Magdala boasted of three hundred shops where pigeons for the sacrifices were sold.[16] About this place the indigo plant flourished then, as now, and the Talmud calls it "the city of colour."[17] More literally, one portion of the city was called "the tower of dyers," and here were eighty shops where fine woollen cloth was made.[18] Arbela, also, was celebrated for the manufacture of cloth.[19] Abundance of flax was raised in Galilee, and the linen fabrics made here by the women were of unusual fineness and beauty.[20] A peculiar kind of vessel was necessary

[1] Hausrath, i. 8; Lightfoot, i. 212.
[2] Graetz, iii. 392; Hausrath, i. 8.
[3] raetz, iii. 392; Hausrath, i. 352; Neubauer, 220.
[4] Gennesareth was Paradise itself. Smith's Bible Dict., ii. 1180, col. 1, Art. "Issachar;" Lightfoot, i. 127; Neubauer, 175.
[5] Neubauer, 175; Lightfoot, i. 127.
[6] Neubauer, 227.
[7] Neubauer, 197, שִׁקְמוֹנָה.
[8] Neubauer, 226; L. 37.
[9] Graetz, iii. 392.
[10] Graetz, iii. 392.
[11] Lightfoot, i. 162; Neubauer, 192.
[12] Life, 13.
[13] Life, 24.
[14] Neubauer, 204, note.
[15] Wars, iii. 7, 12.
[16] Neubauer, 218.
[17] Hausrath, i. 8.
[18] Neubauer, 218; מגדל צבעיא.
[19] Neubauer, 219.
[20] Neubauer, 181, and refs. to Talmud.

for preserving oil, and of the manufacture of this, Galilee seems to have had a monopoly.[1] Kefer Chananyah and Sichin (Asochis ?) were the most noted places for earthen vessels and pots. "The pots made at Sichin, as well as those made at Kefer Chananyah, are well baked and solid." "The clay used in their manufacture is the dark, and not the white, kind." This was the principal business of the inhabitants of these two places, and the business was lucrative. "To come from selling pots in Kefer Chananyah," was a proverbial saying, equivalent to the French proverb, "To carry water to the river."[2]

Galilee could not but be greatly affected by the commerce and other business interests of Phoenicia. Here the manufacture of purple and glass was extensively carried on. Tyre was crowded with glass-shops, dyeing and weaving establishments; and the food for all those citizens and labourers thus employed, as well as for the vast number of sailors which this country sent forth, must to a great extent have been drawn from Galilee.[3] Galilee's own (original) shore, near the river Belus, and including the bed of the latter, furnished the sand for the glass-shops of the world. "Numerous ships" came here to carry this sand to other ports[4]—to the workshops of Sidon and Alexandria, long the most famous in the world. The supply was said to be inexhaustible.[5] Here were found, also, an abundance of shells from which purple was made.[6]

(3.) *Fisheries of the Sea of Galilee.*—We have yet to speak of the fisheries of the Sea of Galilee. The sea abounded in fish of the choicest kinds. The southern portion of the lake, especially, was, in the time of Christ, one of the finest fishing-

[1] Neubauer, 180. As to these pots made from black clay, it is possible that certain fragments of ancient pottery recently dug up at Jerusalem have some connection with them, at least to the *kind of ware* alluded to. In the Birket Israil certain curious vases were found, "all of an extremely hard, massive, black ware, coated in three instances with a dark crimson glaze, perhaps produced by cinnabar."—*Recovery of Jerusalem*, 374.

[2] Neubauer, 202, 226; Graetz, iii. 392, and refs. to Talmud in the three places here indicated. On the question of the production of wine in Galilee, see Neubauer, 82, 84, 180; compare Graetz, iii. 392. See passage in Talmud מנחות, 86, b.

[3] Hausrath, i. 6; Neubauer, 295; Acts xii. 20.

[4] Wars, ii. 10, 2.

[5] Strabo, xvi. 2; Tac. Hist. v. 7; Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 19; 36, 65; Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq., Art. "Vitrium;" Robinson, iii. 104.

[6] Neubauer, 197; Kenrick, Phoenicia, 237.

grounds in the world. Some varieties caught here were similar to those found in the Nile; while other varieties were peculiar to this lake alone.[1] Tarichaea,[2] both the eastern and western Bethsaida ("house of fish"), and possiby Chorazin,[3] derived their names from this business of fishing; and all the cities about the lake sent forth their fishermen by hundreds over its surface.[4] Tarichaea was noted for its extensive "fish factories."[5] Here fish were prepared and packed, and, it has been inferred with some reason, shipped to all parts of the world.[6] They were sought for as luxuries in the market-places of Jerusalem.[7] This trade in fish had enriched the citizens of Tarichaea; and people came even from Jerusalem, especially just before the great feasts, to fish in these waters, and thus provide support for the millions who on those occasions flocked to the Temple.[8] This fishing ground was free to all, so long as one by his nets or hooks or weels did not interfere with the passage of boats. By a common law of the land, dating, as was supposed, from the time of Joshua, this ground could not be monopolised.[9] In Christ's time the Jews distinguished sharply between "clean and unclean fish."[10] This is, no doubt, alluded to in the phrase, "They gather the good into vessels, but cast the bad away."[11] Or, without violence to the passage, we may say that this phrase indicates that the fish merchants about the lake and in the distant markets where these fish were sent demanded the choicest kinds. And the Gospels them-

[1] Wars, iii. 10, 8; Ritter, ii. 285; fish not elsewhere met with, Wars, iii. 10, 7; Tristram, Nat. Hist. Bib., 285.

[2] Ritter, ii. 250; Classical Dict. Art, "Tarichaea;" Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 17.

[3] Keim, i. 603. [4] Stanley, S. and P. 367.

[5] Strabo, xvi. 2, Edit. Leipzig, 1829, vol. iii. 379, near the end; "ἡ λίμνη μὲν ταριχείας ἰχθύων ἀστείας παρέχει;" see Liddell and Scott's Gr. Lex., (6th ed., 1871), under ταριχεία, "factories for salting fish."

[6] Hausrath, i. 5; Graetz, iii. 393.

[7] Delitzsch, Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu, 55; Delitzsch, *ibid.* p. 43, is certainly wrong in his statement that "wealth was not to be obtained in this business."

[8] Bab. Bava Kama, 80, b; see the point discussed and the facts stated in Dr Karl Zimmermann's Theologisches Literaturblatt, No. 43, for June 1, 1869, p. 231, in an able Review of M. Caspari's Chronolgisch-geographische Einleitung in das Leben Jesu Christi, Hamburg, 1869.

[9] Delitzsch, as above, p. 43; Neubauer, 25. [10] See Lightfoot, i. 144.

[11] Matt. xiii. 48; τὰ καλά in this passage means those that are good and of choice quality; τὰ σαπρά must mean the opposite, or those of inferior or poor quality.

selves furnish evidence enough to shew that this business in Christ's time was extensive and profitable.[1]

IX. *The Sea of Galilee a Focus of Life and Activity.*— A mere glance at the life of the Lake is all that we can devote to that topic, before we pass on to consider the cities lying about it, and those that were scattered throughout the province. In those days the sea was covered with ships and boats, engaged either in fishing or traffic, or carrying travellers or parties of pleasure from shore to shore. "Merchants come and go from Hippos to Tiberias."[2] Once when Josephus planned a certain movement against Tiberias, which was to start by water from Tarichaea, he collected for the purpose at that point, apparently in a short time, two hundred and thirty ships from the vicinity of Tarichaea alone.[3] Later, when this city expected an attack from the Romans, the citizens got ready a great number of vessels, to which they might flee in case of a repulse. The day went against them, and they fled to their ships; in these they made a bold resistance, and cost the Romans a fierce and bloody struggle before they could be overcome. That is a bloody sea-fight in which from four to six thousand are slaughtered on one side alone, as was the case here, and not a "sharp skirmish," as one has termed this event. As all could hardly have been killed, the number of Jews killed is a hint, at least, that the number of ships on the side of the Tarichaeans was very large.[4] We are speaking of

[1] Matt. iv. 18–21; Luke v. 2–10; John xxi. 1–11, and elsewhere. See Wars, iii. 10. 8; Stanley, S. and P., 366, 367; Graetz, iii. 392; Hausrath, i. v. *Note* — Probably it is next to impossible for us at the present day to appreciate the extent of the fish business of the Sea of Galilee in Christ's time. The same may be said of this business in Egypt in ancient times. The following facts are interesting, and in a sense illustrative of our subject. Wilkinson, partly on the statements of Herodotus and Diodorus, reports the annual income of the fisheries of Lake Moeris and its sluices which led to the Nile as £70,700, while at present the annual revenue from the fish of Lake Moeris is only about £210. — "Ancient Egyptians" (2d ed., London, 1842), vol. iii. p. 64.

[2] Neubauer, 238, 239, and refs.

[3] Wars, ii. 21. 8; Life, 32: The sight of the lake covered with these vessels struck the Tiberians with terror," Life, 33. See note in Whiston's Josephus on Life, 32.

[4] In the land and sea-fight together, six thousand five hundred were killed: Wars, iii. 10. 1: Graetz, iii. 392; Hausrath, i. 5; Weber und Holtzmann, ii. 480; Josephus describes this fight as terrible; see all of chapter x., Wars, iii. We make the statement in the text, notwithstanding Josephus

Tarichaea alone; but when we think of all the cities and towns by which the lake was surrounded, we can easily understand that in Christ's time it was covered with ships and boats.[1] And as to the appearance of the lake then, "when we add to the fishermen the crowd of shipbuilders, the many boats of traffic, pleasure, and passage, we see that the whole basin must have been a focus of life and energy; the surface of the lake constantly dotted with the white sails of vessels flying before the mountain gusts, as the beach sparkled with the houses and palaces, the synagogues and the temples, of the Jewish or Roman inhabitants."[2]

X. *The Noted Cities and Towns of Galilee.*—If we turn now to the cities and inhabitants of this province, we shall find a country whose surface was dotted with flourishing towns, and covered with a dense population. From the Gospels themselves, we should expect to find here numerous "cities and villages," swarms of people, activity and energy, much wealth, and in some cases even luxury.[3]

Beginning with the Sea of Galilee, we find upon its shores no less than nine cities, while numerous large villages dotted the plains and hill-sides around.[4] Not far from Tiberias lay Bethmaus, where was a synagogue.[5] "About an hour's walk"[6] below the baths of Tiberias lay Tarichaea, where the fish business was, as we have seen, extensively carried on. The lake reached to the walls on two of its sides. Of the sea-fight there we have already spoken. At that time many thousand of the inhabitants were slain; six thousand robust young men were sent to Corinth to work on the canal through the Isthmus there, and thirty thousand more were sold as slaves.[7] This place had had a hard fortune; for in 51 B. C. Cassius took it,

says, Wars, iii. 10. 9, that "not one escaped." For "sharp fight on the plain outside" the city, "and a day or two afterwards a sea-fight," see Recovery of Jerusalem, 283.

[1] The difference between ships and the small boats which are always attached to them is clearly brought out in the Greek of John xxi. 3, 6, 8.—The phrase in Josephus, Wars, iii. 10. 5, "climbing up into their ships," is a significant hint as to the size of some of their vessels.

[2] Stanley, S. and P. 367.

[3] Hausrath, i. 8, gives some refs. [4] Porter's hand-book, 424.

[5] Neubauer, 218; Life, 12: compare Neubauer, 121; see Schwarz, Das heilige Land, p. 140. [6] Wilson, Lands, &c, ii. 124.

[7] Merivale, Romans, &c., vi. 437; Wars, iii. 10. 10.

and carried into slavery thirty thousand of its inhabitants.[1] It was called a larger place than Tiberias.[2] Josephus was brought there by sea (probably because the distance was considerable, and because Tiberias was unfriendly to him) the night after he was wounded near Capernaum. From a passage in Josephus, we gather that ship-building was one of the important industries of the place.[3] About an hour's ride from the Jordan, after crossing it, was situated Hippos, the capital of the district ruled by Herod Agrippa II., and his usual residence. This place was one of importance in the Jewish war.[4] A little further north was Gamala ("*camel*," from its peculiar shape), nearly opposite Tarichaea. It was "the strongest city in that part."[5] The Talmud reckons it as a city of Galilee.[6] It was noted for the bravery of its inhabitants, who vigorously repulsed the three legions which Vespasian led against them, wounding the general himself; but it was subsequently overcome, and terribly punished.[7] Perhaps about three miles further north, "on the left bank of Wady Semakh," was situated Gergesa, near which the scene of the demoniacs and the herd of swine.[8] Passing up the eastern side of the lake, till about two miles where the Jordan enters it, one would reach the eastern Bethsaida ("house of fish," taking its name from the business of the people living there). Herod Philip, the tetrarch, had transformed this place from a fisherman's village into a beautiful and flourishing city, and given it a royal name, Julias, in honour of Julia the daughter of Augustus; and here, in a magnificent and costly tomb, Philip himself was buried in A.D. 33. It was near this city that Christ fed the five thousand with the five loaves and two fishes, and then, after sending the multitudes away, retired to the neighbouring hill to pray.[9]

[1] Ant. xiv. 7. 3; Wars, i. 8. 9. [2] Hausrath, i. 5.

[3] "Materials abundant" for rafts, and "workmen numerous," Wars, iii. 10. 6.

[4] Wars, ii. 18. 1, 5; Neubauer, 238; Traill's Josephus, i. p. 25, in Essay, "Designation of the Persons mentioned in the Life of Josephus."

[5] Wars, ii. 20. 4. [6] Neubauer, 240.

[7] Recovery of Jerusalem, 288; Natural Defences of, Wars, iv. 1. 1; its citadel, Wars iv. 1. 10; the legions were the 5th, 10th, and 15th, Wars, iv. 1. 3; places east of the lake reckoned to Galilee, Hausrath, i. 6; Neubaur, 236, 239, 240, 242.

[8] Matt. viii. 28–34; Recovery of Jerusalem, 286, 287. See addition to Article "Gadara," in Smith's Bib. Dict. (Am. Ed.), Vol. i. p. 853.

[9] Luke ix. 10–17; Ritter, ii. 233, 234.

From this place, after crossing the Jordan, to Tiberias, our starting-point, the distance is only four, or perhaps six, hours ride; yet, within this limited space, along the north-western and western shore of the lake, were situated in the time of Christ no less than five flourishing cities or towns, namely: Chorazin, the western Bethsaida, Capernaum, Magdala, and Beth-Arbel. From this western Bethsaida, which was a beautiful "city" by the sea, three disciples were called,—Philip, Andrew, and Peter, and this may also have been the home of Zebedee and his two sons, the apostles James and John.[1] John calls it Bethsaida in Galilee, to distinguish it from the other.[2] It was intimately connected with many events in the life of Christ. The fine wheat-fields about Chorazin and Capernaum we have already noticed. Beth-Arbel,[3] distant about one hour from Tiberias, had been celebrated as a stronghold from the days of Hosea.[4] Josephus speaks of its fortified caves, which in the early days of Herod the Great were the hiding places of robbers. Its situation was important, as it commanded the road from Galilee to Damascus.[5] In B.C. 39, after Herod was made king, he crushed these robbers by a bold and thorough stroke, perfectly characteristic of the man. Magdala was also, as we have already seen, a flourishing city of this densely populated region; the name has been immortalised in every language in Christendom as denoting the birth place of Mary Magdalene, or better, Mary of Magdala. Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum were those in which "most" of the Master's "mighty works were done," and which, for some reason, he felt it necessary to "upbraid" and denounce. Capernaum was for nearly three years the home of Jesus. Here all the elements of Christ's character were exhibited, as in no other place. And his own words throw much light on the character of the city at that time. It was one of the chief points on the great caravan route between Egypt and Damascus. It had its custom-house, its numerous tax-gatherers, its

[1] A πόλις, John i. 45; Ritter, ii. 233, 270; Article "Zebedee," Smith's Bible Dict. (Am. Ed.).

[2] John xii. 21; Graetz, iii. 393, makes only one Bethsaida, omitting the one in Galilee; Thomson, Land, &c., p. 374 (Eng. Ed.), discards the notion of two Bethsaidas.

[3] Called also "Arbela," and "Irbid."

[4] Hosea x. 14.

[5] Ant. 14. 15. 4-6; Wars, i. 16. 3; Ritter, ii. 266.

Roman garrison, its schools, and its costly synagogue.[1] Besides the places already mentioned as lying on or near the shore of the lake, we have yet to speak of Tiberias on the west side, and which, probably, surpassed any one of the others, both in political and social importance, as well as in the richness and splendour of its buildings.[2] With a decided Roman taste Antipas[3] had lavished here vast sums of money to make this a perfect city. Here, close by the warm springs, and bathed by the blue waters of the lake, this luxurious and worldly Herod, the murderer of John the Baptist, had built magnificent Grecian colonnades, and Roman gates, and splendid public buildings, including his palace, and adorned the city with marble statues, and sought to appease the Jewish portion of the citizens, to whom these things were, no doubt, very distasteful, by building for them, perhaps, the finest synagogue in all the north, "in whose colossal basilica during the period of the revolution the assemblies of the people were held."[4]

[1] Luke iv. 31; Von Raumer, 104; Hausrath, i. 348; "is two short days journey from Nazareth," or "about ten hours," Hausrath, i. 395; "Capernaum, Banias, Dan, the noble city of Tiberias, and a hundred others, have little or nothing to exhibit of their former splendour," Ritter ii. 234; the contrast between the present and former condition of this region is finely presented in Recovery of Jerusalem, p. 264.

[2] Both Capernaum and Tarichaea may have surpassed Tiberias in *commercial* importance.

[3] 4 B.C.—39 A.D.

[4] Life, 54; Hausrath, i. 5. The βουλή or council of nobles of Tiberias numbered in the time of the Jewish war, six hundred members, Wars, ii. 21. 9. Previous to the building of Tiberias, Sepphoris had been the chief city of Galilee. Lewin thinks that Antipas built Tiberias a few years before Christ began his public ministry, about A.D. 27, p. 173, No. 1163. There had been either a battle here, or else an old burying ground, for the workmen came upon quantities of human bones, which made the place unclean to the stricter Jews. It is supposed that Christ never visited the place; for which two reasons are suggested: 1. He may have shared in the feeling of the othodox Jews; or 2. He may have wished to avoid Antipas. See Neubauer, 211 note; Thomson, Land, &c. 398; Ritter, ii. 257, 258; Ant. xviii. 2, 3, for Jewish law violated in connection with these bones; for the supposition of a battle there, Graetz, iii. 256; for Roman style of building, Keim, i. 315. In time of Agrippa II. Tiberias is degraded below Sepphoris, Life, 9; Ritter, ii. 258; there must on this account have been some feeling between the citizens of the two places. Vespasian does not dare to approach Tiberias with less than three legions of his best troops, Wars, iii. 9. 7; Josephus fortifies it, Wars, ii. 20. 6; the old prejudice on account of the bones at last died out. The Rabbis have a tradition as to how the city was made pure, Neubauer, ccxi. Sailors formed quite a class among its inhabitants, Life, 12. This place was the scene of many important events in the Jewish war.

But from the Jordan to the sea-coast, scattered everywhere among the hills, were numerous towns and cities, many of which were of great importance; we may mention Gischala, Kadesh, Safed, Cesarea Philippi (Paneas), Cana, Ramah, Gabara, Jotapata, Japha, Gabatha, Zabulon, Hazor, Rimmon, Nazareth, Tabor, Sepphoris, and in the south Bethshean (Scythopolis) and Gadara. It must not be supposed that this list embraces all of even the important places of Galilee, for Josephus states that it had two hundred and four cities and villages, the smallest of which numbered above fifteen thousand inhabitants. Tarichaea had forty thousand, and Scythopolis about the same number. Japha was the largest "village" in Galilee, and strongly fortified. Zabulon was one of the largest cities in the north, and built in elegant style. It was "a town of admirable beauty," and "its houses were built on the model of those of Tyre, Sidon, and Berytus." Jotapata was "the strongest of the cities fortified by Josephus." Mount Tabor was a stronghold. There was a fortress there from 218 B.C. to A.D. 70. Safed, from its lofty situation, was visible from the shores of the Sea of Galilee. Later, Safed and Tiberias formed two of the sacred cities of the Jews; the two others were Hebron and Jerusalem. Sepphoris was of great importance. It was called "the security of Galilee." Here were the public archives of the province, after they were removed from Tiberias (in the time of Agrippa II.), and here also was a royal magazine of arms. Cesarea Philippi deserves special notice. Herod the Great built here a temple to Augustus, of pure white marble. From early times it had been a place of note on account of its beautiful scenery. "It was the famous seat of idol worship for many ages." Its locality has been spoken of as "the finest spot in the Holy Land;" far up among the hills, beneath Hermon's "eternal tent of snow," with its castles and palaces, its grotto-sanctuary of Pan, and its marble gods, with scenery both picturesque and grand,—it might well be esteemed as "beautiful for situation." A thousand feet above the city rose that primeval citadel, "the tower of Lebanon, which looks towards Damascus." Some of these cities were built on the summits of hills, or, in other cases, on the brows of the mountains, and when seen from afar, were compared to "birds resting upon lofty nests." And many of those places that were strongly fortified were celebrated for severe

and bloody struggles during the Jewish war, and for the bravery of their inhabitants—fighting to the death for their country and homes.[1]

XI. *Josephus's Statement as to the Number of Towns and Inhabitants probably correct.*—We are fully justified in saying that the country at that time was dotted with flourishing cities and villages, and densely settled with an industrious and enterprising people. Josephus's statement that Galilee contained two hundred and four cities and vil-

[1] NOTE.—List of places, Hausrath, i. 6. Japha, Life, 45. Zabulon, Kein, i. 310; Hausrath, i. 10; Wars, ii. 18. 9. Jotapata, Wars, iii. 6. 1; the terrible energy with which the Galileans defended it in the Jewish war cannot here be described, Wars, iii. 7. 33, 34; Vespasian tries to starve it out, but cannot, Wars, iii. 7. 11, 13; valley about it so deep that the sight failed on looking down into it, Wars, iii. 7. 7; how built, *ibid.* Gadara, six or more miles from the shore of the lake, burned, and people massacred by Vespasian, Wars, iii. 7. 1; "its ruins testify to its ancient splendour;" see Smith's Bib. Dict. (Am. Ed.), Art. "Gadara"; its citizens fight at Tarichæa, Wars, iii. 10. 10; Life, 10. Cana, perhaps "Cana of Galilee," where Josephus once was when summoned to Tiberias. Life, 16, 17. Tabor, Wars, iv. 1. 8 see note on this passage in Whiston's Josephus; fortress, see Ritter, ii. 311, 313, 317; size and height of, *ibid.* In 55 B.C. Alexander, son of Aristobulus and rival of Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, rallies at Mount Tabor, and is defeated by Gabinius, and ten thousand of his men (Jews) slain, Ant. xiv. 16. 3. Mount Tabor with its walls and towers and roofs may well have been the "city set upon a hill," Hausrath, i. 397. Safed, Tristram, Land of Israel, 581. Kadesh, *ibid.*, 581, 582; Sacred cities of Jews, Ritter, ii. 268. Sepphoris, Life, 9; Ant. xviii. 2. 1. Seat of one of the five councils which Gabinius established to govern the nation, Ant. xiv. 5. 4; Wars, i. 8, 5; arsenal, Wars, ii. 4. 1; its strength, Wars, ii. 18. 11. The Talmud mentions an "upper," and a "lower" town, Neubauer, 193; Bab. Erubin, 54. b. Cesarea Philippi: Temple of Herod the Great, Hausrath, i. 421; scenery, Ritter, ii. 195, 197; Wars, i. 21. 3; "idol worship," Neubauer, 237; the Talmud reckons it to Galilee, *ibid.* See Ant. xviii. 2. 1; Wars, ii. 9. 1; "the snow-fields of Hermon gleaming in the sun above the dark, giant masses of Lebanon," Hausrath, i. 421; Ps. xlii. 7, 8, is located here by some, Hausrath, i. 421; "tower of Lebanon," Song of Sol. vii. 5; "birds on lofty nests;" see Graetz, iii. 393, Neubauer, 192; notice position of Safed, Sepphoris, Tabor, and other cities. Scythopolis, Arnaud, 216; after Jotapata surrendered, Scythopolis wintered the 15th legion, Wars, iii. 9. 1; Josephus makes it belong to Decapolis, of which "it was the largest city," Wars, iii. 9. 7; but commercially, and in some other regards, it belonged to the region of the Sea of Galilee; both the Talmud and Josephus agree in this, Neubauer, 175, Life, 65; see Lightfoot, i. 126. Scythopolis, and certain places east of the Sea of Galilee, which one usually reckoned to Peræa, the Talmud counts to Galilee. But even if we had not this authority, the fact that they lay on or near the shore of the lake, and would therefore add very much to its life and business, is sufficient reason for mentioning them in our estimate of Galilee.

lages, the smallest of which numbered above fifteen thousand inhabitants,[1] which would raise the population to upwards of three million, has been often quoted; but the truth of it has been almost universally denied, or at least doubted. We propose to give several reasons, never before presented, why the statement of Josephus should be regarded as probably correct.

1. Josephus, as the military governor of Galilee, was intelligent, shrewd, and capable; and he would be likely to know thoroughly the resources of his own province.

2. This statement of his was made in a letter which he wrote to his enemies or rivals, who had been sent from Jerusalem to supersede him in command, and who would have detected him in any misstatement of that kind.[2]

3. Josephus raised, without difficulty, an army "of above a hundred thousand young men." It appears, from the same passage, that, in addition to these troops, there were garrisons in the various fortresses which the general had repaired and strengthened. Then he is particular to say "young men," showing that the supply of men was so great as to make it unnecessary, even in this extreme national emergency, to call upon boys or old men, or others still, who were unfit for military duty. Without doing any violence to the language of Josephus, we might conclude from it that, in addition to the men under arms, there was another body equal in number to these, who were "detained at home to provide supplies" for those in the field.[3]

[1] Life, 45. Dr Schaff in note to Lange on Luke, p. 49, col. 1, says "*four* hundred and four cities and villages;" McClintock and Strong, Cyclopaedia, vol. iii. 717, col. 2. Art. "Galilee," say, "two hundred and *forty* cities and villages"; Graetz, iii. 392, says, "smallest *city* has fifteen thousand inhabitants," which Josephus does not say; Hausrath, i. 7, says, "two hundred and four cities and villages, *and* fifteen fortresses," which is not what Josephus says; "according to Josephus's incredible statement," Keim, i. 311. How does Jahn, Bib. Arch. p. 25 (Eng. trans.), read "two hundred and four cities and towns, the largest of which had one hundred and fifty thousand and the smallest fifteen thousand inhabitants," as if from Josephus? which is not in Josephus at all. See Wars, iii. 3. 2, 4; Tac. His. v. 8; Plin. Hist. Nat. v. 15.

[2] This fact is of great importance, and we may quote here Josephus's own words used on another occasion,—"to publish a falsehood among such as could at once detect it, would be to insure disgrace."—Preface to Jewish Wars, vs. 5.

[3] Wars, ii. 20. 6–8; Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten, ii. 73 (Berlin ed., 1821).

4. In the affair of the robbery of the steward of Agrippa and Berenice, when the people of the towns near Tarichaea were greatly incensed against Josephus for his part in the matter, "one hundred thousand assembled in a single night to oppose him."[1]

5. When, after the conquest under Joshua, the four tribes settled in that country, which afterwards became Galilee, they numbered within their limits sixty-nine cities, "with their villages." Many of these cities were at that time fortified.

6. By a census of that date, the tribes occupying this territory mustered 223,600 fighting men.[2]

7 The slabs from Nineveh say that in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, Sennacherib "took from him forty-six strong fenced cities, and of smaller towns a countless number," besides carrying off "more than two hundred thousand captives."[3]

8. In the year A.D. 39, when Herod Antipas was on trial at Rome, charged with preparing to levy war against the Romans, it was developed in the evidence that in a single armoury he had armour collected for seventy thousand men. This was in a time of comparative peace. What might have been its resources in this respect when the whole province was rallying to defend the common country?[4]

9. If we look forward a few years, we shall find a very significant hint. One would suppose that the Jewish nation in the terrible war of 66–70 A.D., so far as Palestine was concerned, had become almost entirely extinct, the towns destroyed, and the people slaughtered. Yet only sixty-three years later, an army of two hundred thousand men rallied under the banner of Bar Chochab in rebellion against Rome. Julius Severus, the best general of the empire, was sent to

makes the number of men enrolled to be 200,000, which the language of Josephus seems to justify, and which certainly cannot be disproved; nineteen places are mentioned as having been fortified by Josephus, or by his orders, Wars, ii. 20. 6; Life, 37.

[1] Wars, ii. 21. 3.

[2] Josh xix. 10–40; Ritter, iv 334 *et seq.*; Arnaud, 178–183, where the number of cities is shewn to be larger than we have given in our text; it should be noticed that the cities of Naphtali were עָרֵי מִבְצָר, i.e. *fortresses*, or cities with *high strong walls*, Josh. xix. 35.

[3] Rawlinson, Monarchies, ii. 161; Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. "Sennacherib"

[4] Ant. xviii. 7. 2; Keim, i. 205; Hausrath, i. 295.

crush this rebellion. He reported back to the emperor that the rebels were in possession of fifty of the strongest castles, and nine hundred and eighty-five villages. This struggle, which lasted probably three years, cost the Jews upwards of five hundred and eighty thousand lives. The loss on the part of the Romans was also terrible, insomuch that Hadrian, in his despatches to the Senate announcing the conclusion of the war, refrained from the usual congratulatory phrases. If the rebels had fifty strongholds and nine hundred and eighty-five villages in their possession in all Judea, Galilee, in the prosperous years before 66 A.D., may well have had two hundred and four cities and villages.[1]

10. Captain Burton, in his "Unexplored Syria,"—a country which was full of life in Christ's time, but of which very little is known from history,—speaking of the abundance of ruins with which the region just north of Galilee is covered, says, that to one standing on a certain Lebanon peak which overlooks that section, "the land must in many places have appeared to be one continuous town."[2]

11. Still further north in the 'Alah, *i.e.*, the "highland," of Syria, north-east and south-east of Hamah, there are three hundred and sixty-five ruined towns. The Arabs declare "that a man might formerly have travelled for a year in this district, and never have slept twice in the same village."[3]

12. A remark similar to that of Captain Burton just quoted, has been made in regard to the Phoenician coast, which lay west of Galilee, and with which Galilee was in such close connection, namely: "It was so thickly covered with towns and villages that it must have given the appearance of being one unbroken city."[4]

13. It should also be remembered that in those times the *cities* were usually *packed* with people. In our day we are hardly able to appreciate this fact, and certainly we do not make allowance enough for it in judging of the number of

[1] Milman, Jews, ii. 431–438; length of the war, *ibid.* 433, note; terrible losses of the Romans, *ibid.* 432, 433 note; Jost, Judenthum, ii. 79; Madden, Jewish Coinage, 201; Dion Cassius, 69. 15 "Hadrian"; Smith's Bib. Dict. Art. "Census."

[2] I. 79; fine description of the view from this peak, 76-79.

[3] Ibid. ii. 160; Capt. Drake, judging from the ruins which he saw, does not believe the report to be exaggerated.

[4] Dr Schröder, Die Phonizische Sprache, 1869, Einleitung, p. 3.

inhabitants of any given Eastern city or country as reported in the old histories. For instance, no modern city of the size of ancient Jerusalem would have held, much less accommodated, the number of people which often flocked there to attend the feasts. A few years before the siege under Titus, an estimate was made, and the official return was 2,565,000 persons present at the passover. Josephus says 2,700,000, which did not include many sick and defiled persons, and many foreigners who had come for religious worship.[1]

14. Perhaps a hint may be obtained by noticing the number killed in the various battles and sieges of Galilee, so far as these were reported. We have made a careful estimate, and find the whole number to be about 155,630. This includes the prisoners, which, however, except in the case of Tarichaea, were a mere fraction. Several fights are reported where the number of killed is not given. Further, a large number of people would be destroyed in various ways in such a terrible war and never reported. If we put the whole number of killed at one hundred and seventy-five or two hundred thousand, the statement cannot be regarded as an exaggeration.

In the face of such illustrative facts, the statement of Josephus in regard to the cities and villages of Galilee can no longer seem improbable.

XII. *Character of the Galileans*—(1) *Thoroughly a Jewish people.*—It is by no means an easy task to describe minutely the character of this people, numbering perhaps three million, made up as it was of many peculiar original or internal elements, and wrought upon by so many peculiar influences that were foreign or external to it. On the west were the Phœnicians, on the north the Syrians, on the south the Samaritans, and in some of the principal cities of the province were strongly-marked features of Greco-Roman civilisation.[2] Yet this remark in regard to the existence here of Greco-

[1] Wars, vi. 9. 3; Williams, Holy City, i. 481; Besant and Palmer, Jerusalem, the City of Herod and Saladin, note on pp. 23. 24. The "2,700,000" of Josephus will be seen to be probably correct by referring to the passage cited.

[2] Gadara and Hippos are spoken of as Greek cities. Wars, ii. 6. 3; Ant. xvii. 11. 4. The Syrians in Scythopolis seem to have been a majority, Life, 6. The "Strangers" in Tarichaea were not necessarily foreigners, but new comers in distinction from old settlers, Wars, iii. 10. 4, 10; Life, 29. The Greeks in Tiberias were a small fraction of the whole population, Life, 12;

Roman civilisation must not be made to mean too much; for when all the evidence on this point is collected, the real extent of such foreign civilisation is seen to have been very limited. The people preserved, as a body, their thoroughly Jewish character, in spite of any foreign influences tending to the contrary.[1] It is as a Jewish people that the Galileans are to be judged. The fact just mentioned is very significant. Those elements of national character by which a people is preserved from blending with those with whom it comes in contact, form an interesting topic for study. Perhaps the tenacity with which the Jew held to his religious ideas might tend to exclusiveness and bigotry. Yet while he would not allow interference in the affairs of his religion, he prided himself upon his noble treatment of strangers; and, as he allowed foreigners to settle upon Jewish soil, so he claimed the corresponding right, namely, to be allowed to go and settle wherever men were. In Christ's time one might have spoken with truth of the omnipresent Jew. "The Jews had made themselves homes in every country, from the Tiber to the Euphrates, from the pines of the Caucasus to the spice-groves of happy Arabia."[2] A mere catalogue of the cities where they had settled at that time—in the far East, in Egypt, in Syria, in Greece and her islands—is astonishing.[3] With but few exceptions, they seem to have been everywhere a wealthy, and, in general, an influential class. The decrees issued from time to time by the Roman senate favouring or honouring the Jews

compare Life, 65. In Judea also, Gaza was a Greek city, Wars, ii. 6. 3; Ant. xvii. 11. 4; and in Cesarea both Syrians and Greeks were numerous, Life, 11; Wars, ii. 13. 7; Ant. xx. 8. 7, 9; Wars, ii. 14. 4; iii. 9. 1. On Syrian and Phœnician cities, see Ant. xiii. 15. 4; Syrians hated the Jews, Wars, i. 4. 3.

[1] Wars, iii. 3. 2. Greek influence in Palestine in Christ's time can be reduced, we think, to a very small amount. The decided contempt of the Jews, as a nation, for all foreign languages, learning, science, history, etc., would tend to preserve their Jewish character, their religion and peculiar customs, intact. That they preserved their national character free from foreign influences to a far greater degree than many are disposed to admit, is clearly shown by Gfrörer, i. 114–118, and also p. 119. For the efforts of the Jews in the first century after Christ to maintain among themselves a thorough knowledge of the Biblical Hebrew, see Fürst, Kultur und Literatur-geschichte der Juden in Asien, i. 26, 27.

[2] Merivale, iii. 287.

[3] Merivale, iii. 287; Milman, ii. 20; Lutterbeck, i. 128; Wars, vii. 3. 3; Conybeare and Howson, St Paul, i. 16 *et seq.*

in the different cities of the empire were very numerous, and throw much light upon their numbers, character, prosperity, and their civil and social relations and standing.[1] If one should say that the Jews were bigoted in regard to religion, he should remember, at the same time, that, in regard to social, commercial, and political relations, none were more cosmopolitan in either sentiment or practice than they. And if the Jewish people deserve any credit for this cosmopolitan spirit, perhaps the praise should be given to the Galileans, who, on account of their peculiar surroundings, must have led the way in this friendly intercourse with other nations. It will be important to remember this point when we come to consider the religious character of this people.

(2.) *Chiefly an Agricultural People.*—Further, it is chiefly as an agricultural people that we must regard them. There was, indeed, in that period, a vast amount of public building going on (under Herod, Antipas, and Philip), which would require and occupy many men; secondly, we must reckon the lake commerce, which was considerable; thirdly, the fisheries (important, as we have seen); fourthly, the carrying trade—transporting the productions of the country to foreign markets, and also merchandise between Egypt and Damascus.[2] Add to these dyeing, weaving, stone-cutting, ship-building, pottery manufacture, and a few other industries; but when we have made a sufficient deduction for all these methods of employment, we shall have left still the bulk of the population, whose business was agriculture.[3]

Then the wealth and prosperity of this province, together with the good order, both civil and social, which prevailed there, would seem to indicate industry, enterprise, and intelligence on the part of the people.

(3.) *Eminent for Patriotism and Courage.*—Among the prominent virtues of the Galileans we mention here their patriotism. If the influence of surrounding nations had been

[1] Ant. xiv., chapters viii., x., and xii; xvi. 2. 3; xvi. 6. 2; xix. 5. 3; xix. 6. 3; wealth and influence, Ant. xiv. 7. 2.

[2] Whatever landed at Ptolmais for Damascus, and whatever came from Egypt bound for Damascus or the far East, and whatever came from the far East and Damascus, bound for Egypt or Rome, would all pass through Galilee,—an important fact.

[3] Keim, i. 312; Wars, iii. 3, 2.

so marked upon their character as is sometimes claimed,[1] it would have resulted in weakening the ties which bound them to their country and national institutions and ideas; but from the time of Herod's first connection with this province in B.C. 47, to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the Galileans were among the noblest patriots of which the nation could boast. Had this patriotism been wanting to them, even in the least degree, the fact would have been developed greatly to their prejudice in the Jewish war; but in that struggle the Galileans made a noble record. Their intense devotion to "the national idea" has been spoken of as "hot-blooded."[2] Also their loyalty and devotion to their rulers, and their bravery, for which they were justly celebrated, may properly be considered in connection with the topic just mentioned. To the young governor, Herod, they were warmly attached. When he was appointed king, this province declared almost unanimously in his favour.[3] Then, the fact that Antipas held the government forty-three years without special complaint from his subjects, shews a people well-disposed towards a ruler who, whatever may be said of his morals, was, *as a ruler*, liberal, energetic, and capable in every sense. Then, still later, the devotion of the Galileans to Josephus was made by him a matter of special praise. Their interest in him, and their anxiety for his welfare, outweighed all considerations of peril, or loss of property, to themselves. The instances illustrating this statement are numerous.[4] In praising their bravery, Josephus says that "cowardice was never a characteristic of the Galileans."[5] Aristobulus II. and Herod the Great found here some of their most valiant soldiers;[6] and the deeds of the patriot army under Josephus exhibited a marvellous contempt of danger and death. A bold, hardy, industrious race, always does heroic deeds when fully roused and struggling for its fatherland and freedom. This was pre-eminently the case with the Galileans. Their character, as developed in that struggle, may be taken as a hint as to what for three, or

[1] Graetz, iii. 395, exaggerates beyond all reason the influence of surrounding people upon the character of the Galileans.

[2] Keim, i. 314.

[3] Wars, i. 15. 3; for the only exceptions, see Wars, i. 16, 1, 2.

[4] Life, xvi. 21, 39, 45, 47–51, 59.

[5] Wars, iii. 8 2.

[6] Ant., xiii. 16. 5; Keim, i. 313.

perhaps many more generations, had been the character of their ancestors. In judging the Galileans in that war, we must not use the same standards that we judge the Romans by. Difference of race, of civilisation, and of national purpose, must all be considered. It was an agricultural people matched against the finest military people of the world. Among the Galileans the discipline was poor. They fought, as Orientals have always done, with courage enough, and individual valour enough, but with a painful lack of system. Still, taken at this great disadvantage, they command our highest admiration. Josephus is aware that his force is not sufficient to cope with the Romans, and he calls upon Jerusalem for re-inforcements, but none are sent.[1] Galilee must alone and unaided bear the brunt of the war during the first year of its progress. It must be remembered that this period is that of Rome's greatest power. Yet the emperor Nero is "seized with consternation and alarm" at the magnitude of the revolt.[2] The feeling at Rome is expressed by the fact, that Vespasian, the best general of the empire, is chosen to deal with this rebellion; and, secondly, by the fact, that such a splendid army of veterans is thought necessary to be massed at Ptolemais before operations can begin.[3] The sight of these sixty thousand veterans, among whom there is the perfection of discipline, and who are backed by the moral power of almost uninterrupted victory, must send dismay to the hearts of those Galilean youth.[4] This splendid army, that has been victorious over every nation, and whose engines have levelled the foremost structures in the world, has come hither to try its strength and skill upon the people and fortresses of Galilee. The abandonment with which the Galileans plunge into this struggle admits of no retreat. To restore their country's ancient

[1] Wars, iii. 7. 2. [2] Wars, iii. 1. 1. [3] Wars, iii. 4. 2.

[4] Wars, iii. 6. 3; iii. 7. 3. Discipline of the Roman army, see Wars, iii. 5 (all the chapter); a very minute and vivid account of its organization and discipline. Size of the army here spoken of, Tac. Hist. v. 1; Wars, iii. 4. 2; iv. 10. 3; Weber and Holtzmann, ii. 473; Graetz, iii. 437, army about Jerusalem 80,000; see Graetz, iii. 412; Weber and Holtzmann the same, ii. 488; Schneckenburger, 228; power and character of the enemy, Wars, ii. 20. 7; Weber and Holtzmann, ii. 474, quote Hausrath's brilliant description of the character of the two armies and the contrast between them; also *ibid.* 475, Gfrörer's to the same effect from his Preface to the Jewish War of Josephus; fear of Josephus's troops, Wars, iii. 6. 3; lack discipline, Wars, iii. 10. 2.

liberty is the wild dream of these brave misguided men.[1] The tough work before them seems to serve as a stimulus to greater boldness.[2] At Jotapata they fight with desperate energy. The one hundred and sixty projectile engines of the Romans fill the air with murderous stones, and other implements of death.[3] Even after forty days of almost super-human valour, but which is seen to be unavailing, these patriots still prefer "to die for liberty" and "their country's glory" rather than surrender.[4] For six terrible hours the "fighting men" of Japha—the largest "village" of Galilee—beat back the Roman soldiers, till the former, "twelve thousand" of them, were all consumed.[5] The struggle at Gamala is one of the most heroic of the war.[6] Tiberias, Tarichaea, Mount Tabor, and Gischala, fall in succession. The fate of Jotapata sealed, it was said, the fate of the whole of Judea.[7] The backbone of the rebellion was broken when Galilee was subdued. The hardest fighting of the war was done by those brave people of the north. That for her may be called a bloody war, in which one hundred and fifty thousand or more of her people perished. The flower of her youth had fallen.[8] The conduct of the Galileans calls forth generous criticisms even from their victorious enemies. Vespasian notices their fidelity to each other and their contempt of suffering, and Titus admits that "they are fighting for freedom and country," and that "they bear up bravely in disaster."[9] He even appeals to their example as a means of stimulating his own veteran troops. The Romans had reason to be proud of the conquest of Galilee.[10] But their army was weary, and its ranks thinned from the bloody work of this campaign, and Vespasian was obliged to order time for rest and recruiting.[11]

[1] Weber and Holtzman, ii. 463, where the motives are spoken of which could arouse a small people of three or four million against the world-empire and power of Rome.

[2] Wars, iii. 7. 4.
[3] Wars, iii. 7. 9.
[4] Wars, iii. 8. 4.
[5] Wars, iii. 7. 31.
[6] Wars, iv. 1. 3; Graetz, iii. 393, 417.
[7] Wars, iii. 7. 3.
[8] Life, 65.
[9] Wars, iii. 7. 33: iii. 10. 2.
[10] Wars, iv. 4. 3.
[11] Wars, iv. 2. 1; Graetz, iii. 419.

*Note.*—Tac. Hist. v. 1, gives the forces of the Romans as follows: 5th, 10th, 15th, and 3d, 12th, 22d, legions; 20 cohorts of allies; 8 squadrons of horse; also two kings, Agrippa and Sohemus; Antiochus sent the forces of his Kingdom; also "a formidable body of Arabs with embittered feelings" took part; and "a considerable number of volunteers went from Rome and Italy."

(4.) *Their Ancestors Eminent for Bravery.*—The bravery of which we have seen such wonderful exhibitions seems to have been a characteristic of the people of this region from remote times. Their position made them the first to suffer in case of those great invasions from the East, a circumstance which would naturally have a tendency to foster bravery in them.[1] "The people of Zebulon and Naphtali jeoparded their lives unto the death in the high places of the field."[2] Within the limits of this province were embraced some of the most memorable battle-fields of the nation. A people among whom national and traditional customs were cherished as dearer than life,[3] would not be indifferent to old memories and historical associations; and hence the Galileans could not but be stimulated by the noble deeds that had been wrought by their ancestors upon their own soil. The plain of Jezreel was a famous field for strife. Kishon was a river of battle. Deborah and Barak led down from Tabor ten thousand heroes against the king of Hazor, and routed his general, Sisera, and his army. Zebulon, Naphtali, and Asher followed Gideon in the storm against Midian. Soon after the division of the kingdom of Solomon, the princes of Zebulon and Naphtali, in common with those of Benjamin and Judah, led their heroes against Moab.[4] And in the final struggle with Rome, these bold and independent sons of the North rallied, as we have seen, first and foremost to oppose the invincible legions, and battled with desperate energy from mountain-pass to mountain-pass, from city to city, from fortress to fortress, till one after another, the cities and fortresses of this province were beaten into ruins; and then, as the nation rallied for a death-grapple with the enemy, the remnants of the Galilean band joined their countrymen behind the walls of Jerusalem, and resisted with superhuman might that all-conquering power, as it slowly but surely, beat down the walls, and even overturned "the foundations of Zion," burying city and temple and their heroic defenders in a common ruin.[5]

[1] For brilliant description of their position, and statement of the fact we have mentioned, see Hausrath, i. 343.

[2] Judg. v. 18. [3] Ant. xvi. 2. 3.

[4] Hitzig on Ps. lxviii.; Delitzsch on the same; Keim, i. 313.

[5] Hausrath, i. 11; Graetz, iii. 240; Keim i. 315; Hausrath, i. 7, counts "fifteen fortresses" in Galilee.

(5.) *Their Great Respect for Law and Order.*—Again, the Galileans are to be thought of as peaceable and law-abiding citizens. The impression is sometimes given that the very opposite of this was the case. Thus Ritter speaks of the people of Tiberias "as always in quarrels with the parent city of Jerusalem,"[1] for which no authority is given, and which is contrary to fact. And Hausrath, usually correct, states that Josephus calls the Galileans "the common peace-disturbers of the land,"[2] whereas Josephus is referring directly to the robbers in certain caves which Herod had subdued.[3] Josephus does not state, nor say anything from which we might infer, that the Galileans were "turbulent" and "rebellious," or that they delighted in "warfare"; he says nothing of the kind; and the impression left after several careful readings of Josephus is as we have stated—that they were peaceable and law-abiding citizens. Indeed, Josephus make a careful distinction between the inhabitants on the border and the robbers, and shews that the former were not in sympathy with the latter, but were greatly harrassed by them.[4] After Herod had crushed them, "Galilee was delivered from its apprehensions,"[5] which statement of Josephus confirms what we have said. The Syrians even (Galilee's neighbours on the north) sung songs in honour of Herod on this occasion, shewing that they, as well as the Galileans, were not in sympathy with the robbers.[6] Those robber bands on the border, secreted in caves—"dens of thieves"—the guerillas or Ku-Klux of that age,—we hear

[1] Hausrath, ii. 258. [2] i. 10.

[3] Wars, i. 16. 5. Because Galilee was the home of Judas, the Zealot, Graetz states that "the land was full of hot-heads," thus giving a decidedly wrong impression, iii. 395. Similarly M'Clintock and Strong, Cyclopædia, iii. 717, col. 1, Art. "Galilee," state, "the Galileans are mentioned by Josephus as a turbulent and rebellious people," and they refer to Ant. xvii. 10. 2; Wars, ii. 10. 6; iii. 3. 2; of these, the second reference is wrong; the first is an isolated case, and happened in Jerusalem, and does not represent the character of the Galileans at all; in the last Josephus, simply says "trained to war from their infancy,"—meaning that the Galileans, although chiefly an agricultural people, were obliged, on account of their surroundings, to be acquainted to some extent with military affairs. The impression given by M'Clintock and Strong is contrary to fact.

[4] Wars, i. 16. 2, 3. [5] Wars, i. 16. 3.

[6] Ant. xiv. 9. 2, "sung songs in his commendation, in their cities and villages, as having procured them peace, and the secure enjoyment of their possessions."

almost nothing of after Herod made such thorough work in subduing them.[1]

Again, about the year A.D. 51, certain commotions arose in various parts of the land, to which Josephus alludes; and in the same connection he speaks of one occasion when the Galileans on their way to a feast at Jerusalem were assaulted near Ginaea by some Samaritans, and one or more of the former were killed. On account of the negligence of Cumanus, the Roman governor, very serious trouble grew out of this affair. But the affair itself has been greatly exaggerated. For instance, Keim says: "The Galileans were often obliged to open by force a way through the Samaritan district, when they would go to the feasts at Jerusalem."[2] And Hausrath gives the impression that such events were of frequent occurrence. But this event appears to have been an isolated instance; at least, there is no evidence to the contrary, while considerable evidence could be produced to show some intercourse and many friendly acts between the Galileans and the Jews of Judea on one side, and the Samaritans on the other. Then it is wholly wrong to say that "the Sicarii committed more crimes in Galilee than in Judea."[3] The very opposite was true. The facts are these: During the long reign of Herod the Great, Galilee enjoyed prosperity and quiet. The same was true of it, with perhaps one exception,—Antipas's war with Aretas,—during the longer reign of Herod Antipas. During this latter period, the country east of the Jordan, which was ruled by the mild and honourable Herod Philip, also enjoyed peace and prosperity. But Judea, from the death of Herod the Great, in 4 B.C., to the outbreak of the war, in A.D. 66, was full of commotion. The great contrast between affairs in the north and in the south, is strikingly apparent in Josephus's account of these times, although the contrast itself

[1] The Galileans are peaceable citizens; see Life, 41. It is wrong to infer from Luke xiii. 1, "that even at Jerusalem, they took the lead in revolts," Hausrath, i. 11, because we know absolutely nothing of the circumstance connected with the simple fact there mentioned. Milman, ii. 221, calls the Galileans a "warlike" people, which, if he uses the word warlike in a bad sense, is incorrect.

[2] i. 313; Hausrath, i. 21; Ant. xx. 6. 1, "many killed;" Wars, ii. 12. 3, 'one assassinated."

[3] Neubauer, 183 (his authority is Graetz, iii. 2d ed. 323, 334). See next note; they originated in Jerusalem; such desperate characters always spring up in large cities.

is never alluded to by him. From A.D. 7 to the time of the war, Judea was ruled by Roman governors (except the short period covered by the reign of Agrippa I.—41–44), who, for the most part, were unprincipled and cruel men. They hated, oppressed, insulted, and wronged the Jews in many ways. They countenanced robbery, when they could receive a share of the plunder. They encouraged the system of bribery. Under them the priests became corrupt. Murder, violence, lawlessness of all kinds prevailed more and more. The conduct of these governors was very exasperating to the Jews, and, at last, however little disposed for war they were at first, they were driven to take up arms, considering an honourable death better than a miserable life. But such long continued misrule could hardly fail of generating misery and corruption.[1] And in our estimate of Galilee, it is never to be forgotten that, while up to A.D. 51, or perhaps 55, this province was in a state of peace and prosperity, the province of Judea, on the other

[1] Judea overrun by robbers, Wars, iv. 7. 2; ii. 13. 6; Jews oppressed by Romans, Wars, ii. 14. 1; wronged by Felix, who takes Drusilla from her husband for his own wife, Ant. xx. 7. 2; lawlessness, corruption, Jews driven to madness, Wars, vii. 8, 1; country suffers much, Hausrath, i. 344; robbers encouraged, Ant. xx. 8. 5; country full of robbers, etc. Josephus, Ant. xx. 9. 4, 5; xx. 6. 1; Wars, ii. 3. 1; see Wars, i. 8. 8; Romans hate the Jews, Wars, iii. 7. 1; ii. 9. 1-4; Romans insult the Jews, Wars, ii. 12. 2; Florus's conduct, Ant. xx. 11. 1; taxing the Jews, Weber and Holtzmann, ii. 247; increase of robbers, Trail's Joseph. 2. cxli., cxlii.; Patronius, Ant. xviii. 8. 2; Sabinius, Ant. xvii. 10. 1, 2; Pilate, Ant. xvii. 3. 1; taxing terrible, Hausrath, i. 169, 170; the great financial crisis in Rome, in A.D. 33 affecting Palestine; see Hausrath, i. 170, note; priests became corrupt, Ant. xx. 9. 2; poorer priests left to suffer and die, Ant. xx. 8. 8; see Tac. Hist. v. 9, 10; Annals, xii. 54; Jews forced by violence of Florus to leave the country, Wars, ii. 14. 2; yet Cumanus does Jews a favour, Wars, ii. 12. 2 (he could hardly have refused to interfere in this case); Vitellius also does them favours, Ant. xviii. 4. 2; xviii. 5. 3; Sikars, originated in Jerusalem, Wars, ii. 13. 3; (Sikars were assassins with concealed weapons, *Sica*, hence *Sicarii*); names and dates of procurators, see Schneckenburger, 207, 216. The revolt of Judas, son of Hezekias, on the death of Herod the Great, has sometimes been referred to as showing the turbulent spirit of the Galileans. But the commotions at the time were wide spread, and by no means confined to one section; Judas in Galilee gets possession of Sepphoris; Simon makes an insurrection in Peraea, crosses the Jordan, and burns the palace in Jericho; two thousand of Herod's old soldiers make an insurrection in Idumaea; Athronges in Judea sets himself up as King; four parties in four different sections of the country keep the nation in tumult; all these in addition to the fierce outbreak at the Feast of Pentecost that year (May 31); Ant. xvii. chap. x.; Wars, ii. chaps. iii. and iv.; Lewin, B.C. 4, Nos. 931-935, pp. 128, 129.

hand, had, for half a century, lacked both law and order, and there had come to prevail there a terrible state of license and anarchy. The statements here made will be found to be fully justified, if one is disposed to follow out the notes given below.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## AMERICAN QUARTERLIES.

1. *The Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Eclectic.* April 1874. Andover.
2. *The New Englander.* April 1874. New Haven.
3. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review.* April 1874. New York.

1. *The Bibliotheca Sacra* has a good supply of solid and well-written articles. That which first attracted us was the concluding article on "Galilee in the Time of Christ," by Mr Merrill of Andover, the first part of which we have transferred to our own pages. Mr Merrill has the remarkable faculty of so grouping his materials that the reader feels himself as if placed in the midst of the busy Galilean life, an actual spectator of all its manifold social, commercial, and religious activities. With extraordinary industry and enthusiasm he has investigated this subject, and thrown a whole flood of light on the Gospel narratives in which Galilee and its people hold so conspicuous a place. In this number Mr Merrill has another article of a similar character, on "Parthia the rival of Rome."

Dr Hill discusses very vigorously the question of "The Foundations of Theology," and shews how indefensible the position is which is occupied by the positive philosophy and by philosophers of the school of Herbert Spencer, in their rejection of the theological argument for the existence of an Infinite Intelligent First Cause of all things. Professor Mears gives a distinct account of "Herbert Spencer's Religion." He justly commends Spencer as a clear thinker, frank, out-spoken, and unreserved. He does not, like Comte, ignore or disdain the questions involved between philosophy and religion, nor does he leave us in doubt as to his views as Mr Mill does. Though theoretically not an atheist, yet his philosophy denies the possibility of all practical relations between God and man, if it does indeed deny the existence of anything that can properly be called God. While Sir William Hamilton puts religion outside of all scientific relations by his doctrine of the inconceivableness of the infinite, and regards the sphere of faith as entirely different from that of knowledge, Herbert Spencer regards religion as within the range of science, so that science cannot ignore it, but must deal with it as an essential indestructible element of

the constitution of things. He seeks to reconcile science and religion on the ground of ontology, and in this attempt he reduces religion to an ultimate abstraction, devoid of all positive qualities, which he calls the religious idea. He deals with all religions as on a common level, and after stripping away from them all that is specific and peculiar, he reaches at last that which is common to all, some minimum of truth, the existence of something, an inscrutable fact or power behind all the intelligible phenomena of nature—the ultimate religious idea. This idea to which religion is reduced is not a theory of the universe, or some explanation of it, but simply the inquiry of the universe *for* an explanation—the fact that the universe needs to be explained, and that it cannot be explained. This felt *need* is all the religion Spencer recognises.

We have a fine specimen of New Testament exegesis in an article by Dr Woolsey, late President of Yale College, on the words of Jesus to Judas Iscariot, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει, Matt. xxvi. 50. He canvasses the four interpretations that have been given of this passage:—(1.) "That for which thou art come—do," as advocated by Meyer, Ewald, Lightfoot, Alford in his last edition, Lange, &c.; (2.) "For what art thou come," by Calvin, Wordsworth, Alford in his earlier edition, and the greater part of Protestant Commentators generally; (3.) which regards the passage as an exclamation, "For what [a crime] art thou come!" Fritzsche, Noyes, Buttmann in his grammar, &c.; (4.) "*was it this* for which thou art come?" by Bengel. The first of these explanations is that which the writer adopts and ably vindicates.

The remaining articles are "Baptism of Infants and their Church-membership;" History in Alphabets," as illustrating the relations of races, the track of commerce, the spread of religion and the course of civilisation, and "Remarks on Müller's *die Semiten*."

2. *The New Englander.*—The author of a well-written paper on "The Emotions in Music" adopts the old distinction between the soul (ψυχή) and the spirit (πνεῦμα). The former is the seat of sense, feeling, and emotion; and the latter that of intellectual perceptions, reflections, instruction, and moral will or choice. The spirit cannot come into direct contact with matter, but has its royal messengers, its servants, whose reports are submitted to it; but, on the other hand, the soul is open to direct impression, and has no choice but to be excited by that emotion whose appropriate cause is placed before the senses. Thus it is the soul, the principle of animal life, that is affected by music, and not the spirit. Music, subjectively considered, is purely sensuous, and therefore the pleasure which it gives does not involve the exercise of the highest faculties, and emotion awakened by it is not the noblest power with which we are endowed, and the man who lives in the region of feeling, emotion, sense-pleasure, cannot rise to the height of any moral grandeur.

There is an altogether admirable paper on Professor Trendelenburg, of Kiel (died 1872), "The Philologist among the Philosophers, and the Philosopher among the Philologists." The writer shews an extensive and intimate acquaintance with the philosophical systems that have successively arisen in Germany. By a lucid exposition he shews the completeness

of Trendelenburg's demonstration of the radical defectiveness of Kant's proof of the exclusive identity of time and space, and thus his title to be regarded as the representative of a new tide in the historic progress of German thought. From the time of Hegel's death, when the truth of his method of teaching began to be questioned, there arose a general distrust of system-makers, and a new impulse was felt toward historical research. The results that had been arrived at by the preceding philosophers were investigated. The prevalence of this tendency to historical research is greatly due to Trendelenburg. With him philosophy also was the "religion of science." She must bear a due relation to the ideal and the real; she can neither be purely empirical nor purely *a priori*. Ideal-realism is her proper name.

"The True Doctrine of Christ's Second Coming" is discussed in an article which we greatly admire for its comprehensive and, as we believe, scriptural view of this important subject. The writer shews the utter untenableness of the position taken up by pre-millennialists, and well argues that the conception which lies back of Christ's teaching regarding the future of His kingdom is that of development,—the expanding of forces and powers already planted by God within the world as seeds, and destined, by growth under the constant rule and presence of Christ, under the constant working of the Holy Spirit, ultimately to result in the conversion and sanctifying of the world.

The remaining articles are "Primitive Culture," being a *resumé* of Edward B. Tylor's work on that subject, in which he sustains the thesis, that the savage state in some measure represents an early condition of mankind, out of which the higher culture has gradually been evolved by processes still in operation. This is called the progression-theory, as over against the degeneration-theory. Of the other papers, "Buddhism and Christianity" developes the history of the former system, and its moral influence as opposed to Christianity; "Sectarism, Alliance, and the Basis of Fellowship" incidentally reveals, we think, the weakness of Congregationalism as a Church system.

3. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review.*—We are delighted to find in this number of our old contemporary two such able articles as "Modern Scepticism" and "The New Faith of Strauss," along with others so worthy of a place in its pages. We had begun to fear that the *Princeton* was gradually falling into the position of a monthly, but we are glad to see that it still retains its old vigour, and can furnish its readers from time to time with articles of permanent and solid merit. The writer of the article on "Modern Scepticism" presents a distinct and comprehensive survey of the whole field of modern apologetics. The Christian faith is menaced by opponents as deadly as any it has ever grappled with, and has before it a struggle, the severity of which in all probability is to take rank with the most memorable of the past. The danger cannot be ignored. It must be met, not by rejecting, as if they were worthless, arguments which have been gathering strength for centuries, but by presenting them anew in a form adapted to the altered circumstances in which we are placed. It is just

the old battle over again, only with a change of front, and a different handling of the troops and weapons to suit the present demonstration of the enemy. The Christian evidences, as we now possess them, are valid and convincing; what we need to do is to strengthen and stand by them. This is the position which the writer ably maintains.

The history and character of the assaults made at successive times by David Friedrich Strauss (died Feb. 1874) against Christianity, is given at considerable length by Dr Smith, one of the editors of the journal. The whole subject is discussed by Strauss under the four heads:—(1.) "Are we still Christians?" (2.) "Have we still a religion?" (3.) "What is our conception of the universe?" (4.) "What is our rule of life?" In this article Dr Smith disposes in a most satisfactory and conclusive manner of the first two of these questions. We only hope that he will carry out to its completion the plan he seems to have formed, and deal in the same manner with the remaining two. Such papers are eminently useful in guiding the minds of those who may be called on to encounter in practical life the diverse forms of this infidelity which are so widely diffusing themselves over the field of modern literature.

The remaining articles in this number are, "Presbyterianism and the People;" "The Pauperism of our Cities: its Character, Condition, Causes and Relief;" "Catholic Toleration in the State of Maryland;" "Arbitration as a Substitute for War;" "The Office of Evangelist;" "Taxation of Churches, &c.;" and "The Disentombment of Troy."

---

## GERMAN AND DUTCH PERIODICALS.

*Theologische Studien und Kritiken.* 1874. No. III.

Professor Kleinert gives us "Studies in the History of Religion, on the Theory of Sacrifice," in which he discusses a series of questions. The first of these questions refers to the opinion now common, that bloodless offerings are earlier than bloody sacrifices. This opinion is found in Plato and other early writers, but seems to Kleinert inconsistent with the earliest accounts we possess. In particular, when we find that the religion of the Avesta, which contained no principle on which animal sacrifice could be based, yet presents traces of such usage, we can only suppose that bloody sacrifices already existed in the Aryan religion of nature before the Avestan reformation. This, too, seems reasonable, for the only general limitation to the choice of material for offerings, which runs through all religions, is that a man must offer his property. But property in animals is as old as property in agricultural products. If in spite of this the statements of Plato, &c., already referred to, have some historic basis corresponding to the fact that they are put in legendary connection with names like Cecrops, Triptolemus, Numa, Pythagoras

this, according to our author, probably implies an early reaction among the west Aryan nations analogous to the great Bactrian reformation. Passing to a second question, the essayist denies that all human sacrifices are piacular. The idea of life for life, which doubtless often underlay these offerings, does not apply to the sacrifice of captives—especially of firstlings among the captives, which is a practice that often turns up—nor is that idea reconcileable with the Indian offerings, in which human sacrifices are associated with other offerings, or with what we read of Phoenician rites. Fundamentally, it is concluded, human sacrifice is simply the highest species of animal sacrifice. From these premises, Kleinert must of course deny that the sacrifice of an animal is always the surrogate for a human sacrifice. No doubt it was often so, and our author collects many examples in point. But on the whole he thinks human sacrifice, at least in Greece, where we have fullest details, was peculiar to the worship of certain (local) deities, or employed only to avert extraordinary national calamity. Thus there is no call to derive all offerings from human sacrifice. Nor again are all animal sacrifices properly piacular. In the Indian religion the idea of food for the gods is even more prominent in the earliest period, and in Greece the emphasis lies with Homer on the *κνίσση*. Nor, according to Kleinert, is the widespread usage of blood-sprinkling necessarily atoning. Each case must be judged separately; but even in the Old Testament some piacular rites are unbloody (Lev. v. 11), and some aspersions not piacular (Lev. iii. 2; xvii. 6). Nor, apart from the use of the blood, is it correct, as many instances shew, to think that the victim always suffers the punishment which ought to fall on the offerer. *E.g.* the dismemberment of a steer as a winter sacrifice to Dionysus really represents the wintry sufferings of Dionysus, that is of creative nature. But neither is it correct with Wolf and others, to say that all sacrifice is based on the idea that the gods must be fed. Instances against this view are the show-bread, with analogous rites in heathenism where the offering is not consumed by fire, the offering of animals *per contrarietatem* to deities to which they are hateful, and the usage of human sacrifice among the Indians, who regard the sacrificial meal as a joint-meal of the worshipper with his god, but cannot be supposed to have ever been cannibals. In brief, the fundamental idea of all offerings is the expression of homage in a gift. This simple idea is afterwards extended in two directions—(1), anthropomorphically, in the idea that God desires food, and joins in the meal of the worshipper; (2), theomorphically, in the idea that the divine acceptance of the offerer depends on his purification and release from guilt, which leads up to the notion of atoning sacrifice. In this brief outline of Kleinert's argument I have not, of course, been able to convey any adequate idea of the large mass of data which he has worked up, and on which the main value of his paper depends.

A paper by Hollenberg discusses the Deuteronomic constituents of the Book of Joshua. The choice of this subject is a happy one, for the writer justly feels that a more thorough examination of Joshua is absolutely necessary in the present crisis of criticism on the Hexateuch. In general, it is the opinion of the essayist that the Deuteronomic parts of

Joshua are not by the Deuteronomist proper, but by the much later redactor who wrote Deut. i.–iv. 44; xxix., xxx., and united the book to Numbers. The detailed arguments on which this opinion rests cannot of course be reproduced here, but the redactor in question is held to have been, beyond doubt, the man who gave the Hexateuch its last shape. The bearing of this conclusion on Graf's theories, is left an open question, while it is observed that no independent reason exists for placing this redactor after the exile. But if Josh. xiii. 14 is by the last hand which touched the Hexateuch, it is scarcely possible that Graf can be right. On the whole, we welcome this clear and careful paper, which opens up several very interesting points of view.

Diakonus Goebel proposes to expound the parables in Luke xv., xvi., on methodical principles; but neither the principles nor the results of their application are remarkable.

The number contains several brief exegetical notes, of which I mention two. Linder connects the difficult passage, John xx. 17, with the teachings of capp. xiv.–xvii. These chapters would lead the disciples immediately to connect his reappearance after death with the promise to return and take them to the Father. Thus, when Mary recognises Jesus, it is quite fit that she should be warned that this was not yet his final return—that, on the contrary, he was not yet ascended to the Father. Again, Heer remarks in explanation of the narrative of the barren fig-tree, that at the time of year in question there might quite well have still been ripe winter figs on the tree. But also, a fig-tree which is not absolutely barren bears every year. This tree had only leaves; *i.e.*, neither ripe winter figs nor newly formed figs for the coming season, and so was quite worthless. It appears that ripe figs may be found at any time, except during the winter months, when the sap descends. The unripe winter figs which remain hanging then may ripen in the following spring.

*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1874.

The new volume of the *Jahrbücher* opens with a very long essay by Dr Hermann Schultz of Strassburg, on the "Christological Problem of Protestant Dogmatic in the Present Day." The object of the paper is to shew that a Christology which shall alike satisfy the demands of faith and of science, must learn to distinguish as two distinct things the doctrine of faith concerning Christ, and the utterances of history concerning Jesus. All Christological difficulties go back to the fact that the old Church quite ignored the historic individuality of Jesus, which is a thing not really identical with the ideal figure of the Christ. At the present day, one school sacrifices the ideal to the historical, another the historical to the ideal; and Christological science, and with it all theology, must become impossible, unless a way can be found to do justice to both. Dr Schultz argues at length that all questions concerning the life of Jesus are quite indifferent to faith. Even the historical question of the resurrection is, he holds, quite indifferent to theology, and must be left for decision to pure historical criticism. Nevertheless, he refuses to say

with so many thinkers since Kant, that there is no connection whatever necessarily subsisting between the religious idea of the Christ and the historic appearance of Jesus. On the contrary, it is matter of faith that Jesus is the Christ, that Jesus did produce on His disciples the impression of divinity, and that we must never cease to believe that in Jesus the perfect relation of man to God was finally revealed, with might to shape men to a right life, and place them in a right relation to God. The peculiarity of the essayist's position is, that he maintains that this can be done without reference to anything that can seem doubtful to historical science. This position is somewhat obscure, and does not become much clearer when we compare certain guiding thoughts which are laid down for the still undeveloped doctrine of Jesus as the Christ. It is said, for example, that it is impossible historically to prove that Jesus was sinless, but also impossible to deny that the acts of Jesus, and the impression He makes on the mind of faith, produce in the believer the certainty that He is sinless. In like manner, it is said, that faith in the glorified Jesus cannot be reached by any historical inquiry into the way in which His disciples were assured of His resurrection, but must flow from a believing perception of the spiritual forces still working in the Church. Whether these statements really point to any useful principle more novel than the familiar distinction of historical faith and saving faith, may perhaps be doubted.

An unfinished essay, by General Superintendent Bartels, seeks to develop the Biblical doctrine of Baptism in opposition to the views of the Baptists. The origin of the Baptist societies in North Germany is ascribed by the essayist to English and American influences, and the copious literature of the sect does not appear to present anything very different from what we meet with in this country. There, as here, we find the question of dipping put at the head of the controversy, and much more fully treated than the question of the nature of the sacrament. Hr. Bartels goes into the question at large, and in addition to more usual arguments, urges that βαπτίζειν never means a plunging into water and out again, but is used, whether in ordinary Greek or by the Alexandrians, only when some effect of the water on a person or thing is meant. The name therefore is chosen with reference, not to the form of the rite, but to its significance. The second part of the paper, which discusses the nature of Baptism, is not concluded in the present number.

Dr Kluge offers three studies in Biblical Theology, which he appears to regard as original and valuable, but which scarcely were worth printing. In fact, this magazine has now often so much padding, that one begins to question its vitality. The notices of new books, however, continue to maintain their quality.

*Theologisch Tijdschrift.* 1874. Nos. I. and II.

A popular lecture by Rauwenhoff on J. S. Mill, is written with the author's usual elegance, and sketches the life of the English philosopher as delineated in his autobiography in a tone of the highest eulogy. There is nothing in the lecture that gives it a right to appear in a journal for scien-

tific theology, and the fact that this purely popular paper opens the new volume of the *Tijdschrift*, does not augur well for the theological resources of the magazine. In fact, the only article in the first number which does more than review or reproduce the contents of new books, is the second part of Dr S. Hoekstra's essay on the Enduring Significance of the Gospel of the Cross from the modern standpoint. Dr H. first considers the *œconomic* significance of the death of Christ—the blood of the new covenant. The new circle of faith established by Christ, must necessarily maintain its historic continuity with the earlier religion ; for no religion, it is argued, has ever been set forth with success save by a founder who was convinced that he was only reviving old belief. Yet, on the other hand, Christianity required to break utterly with Judaism. These two conditions, apparently inconsistent, became compatible by the death of Christ, which involved, to the belief of the early Christians, the rejection of the Jews and the transference of their privileges to a new community, capable of worldwide universality. This is the whole œconomic significance of the cross of Christ in Dr Hoekstra's theology. Its *atoning* efficacy is discussed in dependence on Kant's well-known theory. Atonement is "reconciliation with ourselves, or true conversion," and is attained when we willingly take upon us that suffering which is inseparable from the putting off of the old man with his lusts. The death of Jesus was not, indeed, a suffering that came upon Him in the struggle against sinful lusts within Himself. In His case, the struggle was against the corruption of His nation, with which, however, He was identified by the law of solidarity. Thus the death of Christ was a speaking example of the principle of Christian life. It also affords a strong, though not an indispensable, stimulus and encouragement to the voluntary acceptance of suffering in order to expiate and conquer sin. And, finally, since the early days of the Christian society had a much fiercer fight with the world than we now experience, since Jesus and His first followers drew on themselves hatred and suffering, exposing their lives for the good cause in a way of which we reap the fruits, it is also true that Christ and the other martyrs of Christianity have suffered for us. This it appears is all the worth which the modern theology can leave to the death of Christ !

The second number of the *Tijdschrift* is equally barren in matter of a kind that invites reproduction here. Of the two longer essays, one by M. G. Collins is simply an account, with a few critical remarks, of Littré's volume of essays, *La Science au point de vue Philosophique.* The essay contains almost nothing theological beyond a mild and somewhat half-hearted protest against the positivist theory of the transitoriness of religion, and what is said on scientific points, *e. g.*, the beginning and end of the solar system, is very antiquated. Is this the reviewer's blame, or is M. Littré (whose book we have not access to) himself ignorant of the law of dissipation of energy? The other essay in the number, by Dr Van Bell, is on the last number of the organ of the Groningen School —the once influential journal, *Waarheid in Liefde.* Dr Van Bell exults somewhat fiercely over the death of this adversary, and discusses at length a criticism on a *lecture* of his, with which it closed. The main



and Klöpper. The views of these critics are examine
of them is found perfectly satisfactory, and Holsten him
fully to acquiesce in any exegesis that has been given hi
certain hints for a better interpretation.. The fullest d
to Beyschlag, from whose view (last propounded in th
for 1871, IV., with special reference to Holsten's book
Peter and Paul) the essayist differs most radically. Tl
chant criticism which Holsten directs against every poi
statements is not free from a certain asperity, due no
bitterment of previous pretty warm contests. The
points in Holsten's position are briefly as follows:—(1.)
very strong philological and dialectical argument is c
the reading ἀνείχεσθε in v. 4, from which it is held that
drawn consistently with the rules of grammar and the
reading ἀνέχεσθε being adopted, two translations becom
ing as in v. 5, λογίζομαι γάρ or λ. δέ is adopted. On the
which Holsten on the whole prefers, the sense is as fol
you be seduced by deceitful statements (v. 3). I hav
for when ὁ ἐρχόμενος preaches a new gospel to you, you
(v. 4). I call the statements addressed to you (which st
on my authority) deceitful, for I judge myself not infe
much-apostles (v. 5). On the other reading, Holsten wou
You tolerate this new preaching (imagining that you
higher true apostle). But I judge that, &c. (3.) ὁ
understood in the most various senses. The force of
ticiple standing absolutely with the article is such th
class meant has "coming" for its special characteristic
of these preachers is that somehow they are "comers."
that this is best taken in the sense "incomers." The
properly belonging to the Christians of Corinth, but now

r 69, just as Vitellius was tottering to his fall. Further, he identifies spasian not only with the sixth head, but with the other beast of xiii. 11. beast rises ἐκ τῆς γῆς—*i. e.* from Judea (or at least from Asia), where spasian was proclaimed emperor. His two horns are his sons. Verse refers to the war in Judea; v. 13 to Vespasian's miracles in Egypt the oracle he received at Carmel. Verse 15 may be explained by posing that in the earlier part of the campaign Vespasian marked his ories by the erection of statues of Nero, the reigning emperor, while 16, based on the usage of military tattooing (Vegetius de Re Milit. ), refers to the unusual course which he adopted of taking an oath llegiance from the population as well as the military. Verse 17 rs to the prohibition of the export of corn from Egypt to Rome.

nother part of the essay discusses the 5th book of the Sibylline les in the light of the Avesta, and comes to the conclusion that a hic pre-existence was ascribed to Nero, on the ground of his identifi- on with the snake-tyrant of the Avesta, Azhidahaka. This is con- d with an endeavour to give an exact date for the Sibylline verses estion. In addition to these points, the author gives a copious col- on of facts about the identification of the imperial power, and of vidual emperors, with the Messiah or the Antichrist respectively. collection does not stand always in the closest connection with the hor's new results, and is in some measure a mass of rough notes, but tains much interesting matter.

ilgenfeld writes against Zahn's defence of the genuineness of the tian epistles. Grimm shews that it is not correct to quote Heracleon, elling that the apostle John suffered martyrdom, and Rönsch con- es his *xeniola theologica.*

---

## NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

### Theology and Philosophy.

*Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; being the Baird Lecture for* 1873. By Robert Jamieson, D.D., Minister of St Paul's Parish Church, Glasgow.

*Mysteries of Christianity; being the Baird Lecture for* 1874. By T. J. Crawford, D.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London.

ese volumes are the first-fruits of a foundation due to the munifi- of Mr Baird, who, besides other splendid donations to the Estab- d Church of Scotland, has instituted a Theological Lectureship in nection with that church, similar to the ancient Bampton and ean Lectures in England, and the Cunningham Lecture in the Free



vast, varied, and continually-increasing literature of thi
has been so much discussed in modern times. It could ha
be looked for that these lectures should discuss the mo
and arguments on the subject of inspiration, or embody th
of Biblical criticism. Still, without these, good services
to the cause of truth by a lucid statement of the doctrine
remove misconceptions, and obviate many common objec
logical exhibition of the grounds on which it is believed
theologians. Even in these respects, however, the work
a large extent, defective. There is a great want of p
Jamieson's statements of the doctrines he undertakes t
considerable confusion in his arguments in support of it.
statement of the object of his lectures, "to set before yo
of this momentous fact, that the Scriptures of the Old a
ments are the revealed Word of God, and the only supre
and manners" (p. 10), is exceedingly vague; and it is not
more definite by the subsequent explanation (p. 12), "
though consisting of matter written in the language an
pen of mortals frail and fallible as other men, yet bears
a divine origin and character, consequently is of supr
authority." It is a good feature in these statements th
authority of Scripture is made so prominent; for that re
essential point in our views about the Bible, and determi
the nature of our theology. But a good deal more e
definition is necessary to bring out in connection witl
believe inspiration to be. The vagueness in the defi
considerable confusion in the arguments for inspiration i
The precise question at issue is mixed up with that of tl
one hand, and with the more general one of the divine c

Synagogue, are maintained,—though they are all doubtful, and some now generally rejected. In regard to the New Testament, it is assumed that our Lord's promises of the Spirit in His farewell discourses, instead of being assurances of spiritual enlightenment to all Christians, are predictions of inspiration to the apostles, and that after the day of Pentecost they were rendered perpetually infallible in all their sayings and writings. These are surely untenable and dangerous positions. Dr Jamieson's style is sometimes cumbrous and inaccurate, and altogether his lectures do not form a contribution of much value or importance to the support of the great and much discussed doctrine which he labours with commendable earnestness to defend.

Dr Crawford, who delivered the second series of Baird Lectures, has proposed to himself a more limited task,—to consider, namely, "whether the mysteriousness of certain doctrines can of itself be deemed a sufficient reason either for excluding them from the articles of the Christian faith, or for discrediting the Christian system on account of them, as unworthy of the divine origin and authority which it claims to possess." This is not indeed the form in which the question would be put by the adversaries that Dr Crawford has in view; they are not wont to recognise the idea of mystery, as he and most believing theologians understand it; and they would say that what we would call mysteries are absurdities or contradictions. Hence, the real hinge of the controversy turns on the point, whether the difficulties of the Christian faith are really mysteries, *i. e.*, truths not fully comprehensible by us. The first five lectures of this course are occupied with a consideration of the various respects in which a doctrine may be mysterious, shewing that on various grounds it is reasonable to expect that truths about God may be beyond our comprehension. The discussion is not indeed very profound, and does not enter upon the philosophical and theological questions regarding our knowledge of the Infinite, that are indispensable to a thorough investigation of the subject; but it is clear, sensible, and satisfactory, so far as it goes. It is shewn conclusively, by examples taken from various departments of knowledge, that there are things undoubtedly proved to be true, as to which unanswerable questions can be raised; and thus, that things may be above reason which are not against reason. But in order fully to vindicate the principle thus practically established, it would be necessary to discuss the question of the province and limits of human reason, in some such way as Mansel has done in his Bampton Lectures, whether adopting his conclusions or not.

The remaining lectures of the course are occupied with an application of the results of the general inquiry to some of the more important mysteries of Christianity, in particular, the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Regeneration, and Predestination. In his treatment of these topics, Dr Crawford shews himself an eminently cautious theologian, with much of the clear, sound judgment of Hill, making as little use as possible of theories and speculations of reason, and discarding some of those that have been employed in the elucidation and support of the doctrines that he defends. This is especially apparent, and somewhat excessive, in his treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity,

the statement of which he seems to reduce very much to a series of merely negative propositions. The process of definition and determination has undoubtedly been sometimes carried to an undue extent on this mysterious doctrine; but surely something more can be done towards its elucidation than the mere negation of all the heresies in turn. The overbold speculations of scholasticism need not drive us to the opposite extreme of an abnegation of all positive thought on the subject. In the lecture on the Incarnation, again, the assertion of two natures and one person is treated very much as if it were the very language of Scripture, and not a theological formula, adopted to harmonise the various truths gathered from Scripture, and needing to be justified by an analysis of the ideas embodied in it, and a comparison of them with the facts of revelation. The discussion of the doctrines of Regeneration and Predestination is exceedingly good,—that of the latter, in particular, being well fitted to remove many of the misconceptions and prejudices with which it is regarded by many. The style of the lectures is admirably clear and elegant; and the tone in which Dr Crawford deals with those who differ from his views, is very fair and courteous. If the present volume does not contribute much fresh thought to the great themes of which it treats, it exhibits them in a very clear and judicious way, and shews them to be, though mysterious, yet not on that account incredible, which is all that the author proposed to accomplish.

*The Superhuman Origin of the Bible inferred from itself. The Congregational Lecture for* 1873. By Henry Rogers. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1874.

Any contribution made by the author of the "Eclipse of Faith" towards the defence of the fundamental principles of Christianity is sure to be welcomed by all who are interested in resisting the continual attacks upon revelation and revealed religion, and if readers miss somewhat of the old brilliancy of style in the book now reviewed, they will still find the strong common sense and the shrewd estimate of the worth of evidence which have characterised all Mr Roger's writings. The book is one which is much more suited to the practical Englishman, who almost deifies plain common sense, than to men who are much afflicted with speculative difficulties about Christianity and its basis. The aim of this "Congregational Lecture" is to prove the *superhuman* origin of the Bible (and by the wise selection of the adjective, Mr Rogers has at a stroke cut himself free from a whole host of intricate speculations which cluster round the more usual word *supernatural*), by shewing the difficulty of accounting for it by referring it to purely human forces. The Bible exists among us. How did it come there? That is the problem to be solved. Is it the result of the ordinary work of the mind of man deeply pondering through many generations on the great questions of existence, or must we suppose superhuman forces to have been at work in order to account for it? The problem is complicated by the fact that the Bible is only one of many so-called revelations—one of a number of somewhat similar phenomena, all of which pretend to a superhuman

origin. It has often been assumed that because the Bible is in *some* respects similar to other pretended revelations, it must be like them in *all* respects, and that its claim to a supernatural origin at once falls to the ground when their claim is proved to be inadmissible. And so the question comes to be: Are there so many and so great points of contrast between the Bible and all other professed revelations, that the difference can only be accounted for by a difference in origin, by supposing that the Bible cannot have been produced by merely human forces? Mr Rogers summarises these points of contrast under five heads, and his aim is to shew, that when these are clearly and forcibly displayed, we are shut up to the conclusion that the Bible is of superhuman origin. The Bible differs from all other books, because it is *out of* analogy with human nature. If the book were of human origin, it would have advocated, or at least tolerated, idolatry of some sort or other; it would not have concerned itself so exclusively with God; it would not have placed ethics in such strict subordination to theology; no book of merely human origin could have described and enforced a morality in such violent contrast with human nature as the morality of the New Testament; the Jews could never of themselves have originated the idea of Jesus; they could never by any *natural* process have originated such a book as the New Testament, and such a religion as it contains, which is full of inexplicable paradoxes when regarded from the merely human side; no suggestions of mere human sagacity could have kept ignorant men like the Apostles so free from the errors and failures of all other philosophers and religionists. On the other hand, the Bible seems to be in unison with the works and ways of God as disclosed in the constitution and course of nature; it has been gradually produced, for example, and there are wonderful coincidences between the statements of Scripture and the facts of history. In the third place, there is a wonderful *unity* in the Bible. The book is the product of about fifty different authors writing under every diversity of circumstance, and at far distant dates, and so this unity cannot have been produced by any collusion between the various writers—it must have been caused by a superhuman power. Again, there are in the Bible peculiarities of structure, matter, and style which distinguish it from all other books; for example, a very constant trait in the manner of Biblical writers is an all-prevailing dramatic form of narrative and an almost entire absence of reflection or comment; another characteristic is the freedom of the authors of the Bible from vanity, egotism, and ambition,—they preserve an "unnatural" calm while relating the most wonderful facts; but perhaps the most striking characteristic is the fact that the Biblical writers, and especially the Evangelists, have so completely hidden themselves in their theme, that they leave us neither power nor inclination to think about them;—all these characteristic traits separate the Bible from human literature in general. Lastly, an argument for the superhuman origin of the Bible may be found in its exceptional position in the world. It has survived when other similar records have perished, it has been welcomed by every variety of race, it has gathered round it a prodigious literature, no other book has left so many and so deep traces on human literature, none other is so untouched

by time. Such is a short summary of Mr Rogers' argument—an argument which much more appeals, as we have said, to the practical common sense of people not much troubled with speculative difficulties, than it helps to solve the problem from the standpoint of modern criticism. For Mr Rogers does not meet the ordinary and everyday objections against the superhuman origin of the Bible which are so common and seem so powerful at the present time. His method itself is defective, for he has mixed up two things which ought to be kept carefully distinct in any scientific discussion about revelation. Any discussion upon the supernatural origin of the Bible must separate into two distinct lines—the superhuman origin of the manifestation of God, of which the Holy Scripture is the record, and the superhuman origin of the record itself. To mix up the two problems, which are perfectly distinct and in a measure independent the one of the other, is fatal to a satisfactory scientific discussion of either; but this is what Mr Rogers has done. How far is that manifestation or process of life or force in the world, which is described to us in the Bible, a thing *sui generis* and unaccountable upon any ordinary human hypothesis? is one question. How far is the record or account of this manifestation due to the interposition of superhuman power? is another question. An argument which absolutely ignores this distinction cannot have much scientific value. But setting aside this objection, Mr Rogers does not fulfil the conditions which his argument, as he states it, requires. His thesis is that there are such points of contrast between the Bible and other records of revelation that the one must be of superhuman origin, even if the others be merely human; but this argument requires a careful comparative account of revelations which is nowhere to be found in the book. This comparative history of religions and the revelations on which they are based must play a very important part in the apologetic of the future, but it has no place in the book under review. This defect leads in its turn to another fundamental error in Mr Rogers' reasoning, this, namely, that while his whole argument rests on the exceptional character of the Bible when compared with other books, he does not define what he means by exceptional. He has no criterion to distinguish between what is, and what is not, "out of analogy" with human nature; for example, when he speaks of the unity of the Bible, he does not recognise any link of connection between the various writers, except that of a preconcerted plan, which is in the nature of the case impossible, and that which arises from the fact that the writers of the Scriptures were inspired by the same Divine Spirit. Now, there might be many other reasons—oneness of race, of national ideas, &c.—and Mr Rogers gives us no criterion which enables us to reject all these various reasons as insufficient. The book, in short, while a good practical summary of the commonplace arguments for the superhuman origin of the Bible, does not contain anything which is not to be found in Bishop Butler's "Analogy," or might not be immediately suggested thereby; and altogether fails to understand and meet in a scientific way the speculative difficulties which are advanced against the thesis Mr Rogers defends.

*The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment vindicated against Recent Attacks.* By the Rev Professor WATTS, D.D. Belfast: William Mullan.

We have perused this publication with admiration of the author's ability, and the fine spirit in which he treats his awful theme. As the title indicates, he confines his observations to the most recent phase of the controversy concerning the eternity of future punishment. Long ago Dr Chauncy declared, that "if Universalism should be found to have no truth in it, the second death ought to be considered as that which will put an end to the existence of the wicked;" and as this apprehension seems to have been felt by the opponents to the orthodox view to have been well founded, by far the majority of those of the present day espouse the notion of the annihilation of the finally wicked, either by the direct infliction of God at some period subsequent to judgment, or, as the late Professor Hudson expressed it, by their languishing back to naught. This theory has of late found many advocates in the Irish and English Episcopal Churches, and not a few also among English Baptists and Congregationalists.

Dr Watts sets out with noticing that these theorists all agree that the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment is repugnant to the moral constitution of man, and the moral character of God. In reply, while admitting that reason has a legitimate province in judging of a professed revelation, he shews, from both Scripture and the general consent of mankind, that conscience biassed by sin is incapable of deciding the question, "What sin deserves at the hand of God." He next proceeds to argue that it is not true that Divine love dominates in the moral government of the universe, and remarks, "that instead of love regulating the exercise of justice and setting limits to penalty, it is the prerogative of justice to regulate the exercise of love, and set bounds to its outgoings towards those upon whom justice has claims."

It appears to us, that upon this point the learned Professor has somewhat overstrained his argument. Are we warranted in representing justice as dominating in the scheme of redemption? Does Scripture not rather represent love as its distinguishing characteristic? Or is it proper to speak of one Divine attribute governing another? Does Scripture not rather represent them as acting in harmony? To meet this objection of the Destructionists, it seems to us only necessary to shew that punishment is not inconsistent with love, and the instances which Dr Watts adverts to are surely amply sufficient for that purpose. With this exception, we regard the argument as sound, and that of his opponents leading, as he shews, not to the doctrine of annihilation, but to that of universal restoration.

His opponents foreseeing this conclusion, allege "that the Divine agency, in its effort to reclaim, is limited by the free agency of those to be reclaimed; and that moral agents are beyond the reach of any restraining or reforming influence save moral suasion." Dr Watts, in reply, shews that this theory of free agency is in opposition to the Scripture doctrine of man's creation and the soul's regeneration.

"If creative power," he says, "has produced a holy moral character

it is obvious that the production of a holy *habitus* was not beyond the reach of Omipotence." Again he says: "If God can, despite the prerogatives claimed for the will of man, effect that change in man's moral estate which is described as a new creation . . . who will venture to assert that He could not effect a like transformation in the moral estate of the entire human race? The doctrine thus established," he adds, "is fatal both to the annihilationists and to the restorationists. It is fatal to the former; for if the free will of moral agents does not present an insurmountable obstacle to the regenerating energy of the Holy Spirit, the benevolence of God would lead us to expect that He would restore rather than annihilate. It is fatal to the latter; for if regeneration be not limited by the will of the wicked, but by the will of God, surely we must infer that His benevolence would lead Him to restore the fallen at the earliest possible stage in their history. In a word, as free agency presents no obstacle to the Divine intervention, the conclusion is inevitable if we accept the theory which enthrones love as the all-controlling, all-determining attribute of God, that He would not have permitted sin to enter His universe at all, or that, having permitted its entrance, His infinite love would move Him to expel it, not after centuries of suffering in hell, but upon its first manifestation among the creatures of His hand."

In addition to thus meeting these two arguments of the Destructionists, Dr Watts reviews the Scripture terms on which they mainly base their theory. These terms are *Death*, *Destruction*, *Perish*, *Lost*; and the rule by which they interpret them is, "The literal sense of words is *primâ facie* their true sense, unless overruled by the connection, or by the general sense of the book in which they appear." We by no means object to this canon of interpretation; but it is obvious that did the Destructionists act upon it, they would refute themselves. It is because the connection and general tenor of the book in which they occur demand a far more significant import than what they would assign them, we do not accept of their interpretation; indeed, the words even viewed literally do not imply annihilation. We regard Dr Watts as singularly effective in dealing with this branch of the subject, and yet had he extended his survey of the literature of Destructionism, his argument would have been even more conclusive. To adopt the literal mode of interpretation in determining the import of words of this class when used to express the final doom of the impenitent, is to reduce these awful representations to absolute absurdity. It would teach that the wicked shall be literally consumed, literally devoured, literally burnt up, literally ground to powder, literally plucked up by the roots, literally broken to shivers, literally trapped with gins, and literally melted like wax. Notwithstanding the aid which the ripe scholarship of the late Professor Hudson has rendered this theory, it may be asserted that its weakness is never more apparent than when its advocates resort to the texts in which these words occur.

One argument much relied upon by Destructionists has been overlooked by Dr Watts; we mean their denial of the natural immortality of the soul. They hold that man was created not absolutely immortal, but in a certain sense for immortality, and that he has forfeited the boon through sin, but that it is recovered through faith in Christ. This argument they employ with considerable plausibility, as Bible writers seldom assert in direct terms the immortality of the soul, but to a large extent take it for

granted. It is not, however, on this account less obviously revealed in Scripture, as it underlies the entire scheme of mercy, and is implied in all its announcements of future bliss and woe. It might with equal plausibility be argued that there is no God, as the Bible writers never attempt to prove His existence. In adverting to this omission, it is proper to notice that Dr Watts' tractate is simply the substance of two lectures delivered to his students, and that as a wise professor will rather seek to stimulate inquiry than attempt an exhaustive discussion of his theme, we can easily understand the reason of it. We cannot, however, close these remarks on this able publication without expressing the desire to see a more comprehensive work on the same subject from the pen of its author, as he is evidently possessed of a rare combination of the qualities necessary to the effective treatment of such a theme. As it is, this publication will be of essential service to those who desire to master the most recent phase of this interminable controversy, and is likely to influence favourably the cultured advocates of the theory condemned.

*Modern Doubt and Christian Belief: A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth.* By THEODORE CHRISTLIEB, D.D., University Preacher and Professor of Theology at Bonn. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1874.

We are glad to see Professor Christlieb's *Moderne Zweifel am Christlichen Glauben* in an English form. Nor is our welcome the less hearty that the author has remodelled his work so as to adapt it to English readers. The book is written with a distinct aim of a most important kind, viz., to give to intelligent laymen a fair and full idea of the present state of the never-ending controversy between doubt and Christian faith.

"The lectures," says the author in his preface, "are not, it will be seen, intended to be 'popular' in the broadest meaning of the word. They are primarily addressed, not to the great body of uncultured or half-cultured readers, but to earnest-minded inquirers among the really cultivated, who are accustomed to think logically, and whose mental powers I have accordingly in some passages pretty severely taxed. I have, however, throughout endeavoured to make myself widely intelligible, as well as to preserve the scientific character of the work; and I venture to hope that it may be of some use to students of divinity and other younger men at our universities generally, by conducting them to at least a preliminary acquaintance with the most important theological questions of the day."

The lectures (or treatises) of which the book is made up are upon the following subjects:—(1.) The Existing Breach between Modern Culture and Christianity. (2.) Reason and Revelation. (3.) Modern Non-biblical Conceptions of God. (4.) The Theology of the Scripture and of the Church. (5.) The Modern Negation of Miracles. (6.) Modern Anti-miraculous accounts of the Life of Christ. (7.) Modern Denials of the Resurrection. (8.) The Modern Critical Theory of Primitive Christianity. Over this wide field Dr Christlieb guides his readers with the ease of one to whom all the bearing of every point are familiar. Nothing could be fairer, and it is scarcely possible that anything could be sadder, than the account given in the first lecture of the chasm between Christianity and culture in Germany. The

same fairness marks the treatment of the questions as they are handled in detail in the subsequent lectures. Dr Christlieb has a happy power of stating in a few sentences the real subject of controversy in each case, and he never stoops to do an opponent an injustice, even by omission of any important element in that opponent's argument. While all the book is of great value, and occupies a position in which it has no competitor, the closing lectures seem to us the most noteworthy. We do not believe that the English reader could find anywhere else so full and interesting an account of the "Lives of Jesus;" of the modern attempts to explain away the stupendous central miracle of Christianity—the resurrection of the Lord; and of the Tübingen school and its great founder, Ferdinand Christian Baur. Indeed, we should advise all inquirers to purchase the book, if for nothing else than to learn what the Baurian view of Christianity and Christendom really was. Himself a native of Würtenberg, and a distinguished student of Tübingen, Dr Christlieb writes not only with a generous desire to do justice to the remarkable man whose works are moulding the whole form of Christian investigation in our time, but with an unconscious pride in the fact that Baur was, like Paulus and Strauss, a man of Würtenberg. But he also writes as one who learned years ago to shake off the spell of his teacher's influence, and who can therefore guide other inquirers to intelligent rejection of the plausible "critical theory of primitive Christianity."

We have only to add that the lectures are in animation, in clearness, in skilful grouping of topics, in occasional and always appropriate eloquence, worthy of the author's reputation as one of the most eloquent preachers of the day, to whose university sermons men as well as women crowd—a sadly rare thing in Germany. The translation is very readable, and does credit to translators and editor, who have had all the benefit of the accomplished author's own supervision.

*Everlasting Punishment and Modern Speculation.* By the Rev. William Reid, Lothian Road United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh. William Oliphant & Co., Edinburgh.

This book gives evidence of much reading and earnest study. Its author seems to have made himself thoroughly acquainted with the entire literature of this momentous theme. Thus prepared, he has followed our modern sentimental theologians, who deny the eternity of future punishment, through all the windings of their tortuous pathways, and bringing all their speculations to the unerring standard of inspiration, has demonstrated the utter baselessness of their theories. The result of these labours is a work of very great value, entitled to take high rank in apologetic literature, and entitling its author to the thanks of all who are set for the defence of the gospel.

The only point—and we consider it of great importance in a thorough discussion of this subject—in which Mr Reid seems at fault, is the bearing of the question of the freedom of the will on this controversy. On page 149, he says—"It is not, therefore, consistent with our nature or the government under which God has placed us, to sanctify and save any, con-

trary to their own free will. The soul elects for itself; is controlled by no other; and God interposes no invincible barrier to its choice." If this means, as it seems to mean, that God, in the government of free agents, is restricted to the apparatus of moral suasion, it involves the denial of a doctrine which must be as clear to Mr Reid as it is to all God's people, namely, the doctrine of regeneration. If, as the scriptures teach, the Holy Ghost can take hold of a man who is dead in sin, and make him alive, creating him anew, destroying the enmity of his heart towards God, and implanting the holy *habitus* which determines his will, surely it cannot be said that "the soul is controlled by no other." This is the doctrine of scripture, and its value in this controversy is manifest; for it were surely a more benevolent thing for God to regenerate than to annihilate, or to regenerate by His spirit at once, than to purify by means of a process of purgatorial fire, carried on through, it may be, myriads of ages.

Notwithstanding this defect, we regard Mr Reid's book as one of the most valuable contributions to our Christian apologetics which has appeared for a long time.

## Old Testament Exegesis.

*The Chronology of the Bible, connected with Contemporaneous Events in the History of Babylonians, Assyrians, and Egyptians.* By Ernest de Bunsen. With a Preface by A. H. Sayce, M.A. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1874.

Few treatises on chronology command general attention, and there is nothing in the style of Ernest de Bunsen to attract any to the themes on which he expatiates. To intimate, at the outset of his essay, that his great aim will be to prove the incorrectness of "the most ancient period of 1656 years and that of 480 years," does not seem the best way of securing an earnest hearing for the discussion of the many points of contact between Bible chronology and the revelations of modern times derived from Assyrian and other sources. Few will choose to be bound by the 1656 years usually ascribed to the period between Adam and the flood; neither will many care though the 480 years of 1 Kings vi. 1 be proved an interpolation. Professor Douglas, in Fairbairn's Dictionary, has triumphantly defended the 450 years assigned by Paul to the period of the Judges, as opposed to the 480 years into which the whole transactions from the Exodus to the building of the Temple are usually condensed, so that there is little occasion to exclaim, with our author, "Holy Writ corrected by holy tradition." In like manner, the long period of 430 years for the Egyptian bondage can be, and has been, vindicated as against the 215 years of Usher. Yet, in order to the reconciliation of Paul with Genesis, Mr Bunsen makes the Hebrews enter Egypt, and commence the period of their servitude, "a few years after the victory over Chederlaomer and his allies,—that is, certainly not later than thirty years after Abraham's leaving Mesopotamia."

Of the more liberal scheme of Bible chronology, indeed, the learned

writer appears to be in ignorance. He chooses to stand by the Septuagint and then accuses the Hebrew version of tampering with the figures in the lives of the Patriarchs, in order to get a support for the 7000 years which it is assumed the Hebrew writers regarded as the period of the world's existence. "We maintain that the pre-Noachian period, thus unhistorically shortened, was made to appear historical. This was done by regarding as personal names the names given to periods, by assuming that each patriarch had only one son, and by letting these sons live together with their fathers exactly as many years as were required to the extent of 7000 years." Such assumptions cut pretty deep as regards the worth of the early genealogies. But when the whole of this theory is based upon the seventy years of the captivity and the author's mode of interpreting the seventy weeks of Daniel as denoting seventy jubilee periods, or 70 × 50 = 3500 years, we are freed from any great anxiety. Is it the case that "the initiated contemporaries of Zerubbabel, of Joshua, and Ezra, would know that the Millennium, the coming of the expected Messiah, must begin analogously with the typical return under Zerubbabel, with the Jubilee of Jubilees, or after 50 × 50 = 2500 years after [illegible] B.C."? Is it true that "thus the Millennium was placed in the approaching time, from 1914–2914 A.D."? If so, it is passing strange that "the seer of Patmos expected the Millennium in his time, or soon after, and thus proves that he certainly had no knowledge of the unhistorical and unprophetic scheme of the time of Ezra." How could Ezra either sanction or suggest a "scheme which has given rise to the theory of the Millennium," when John, who alone has written about the 1000 years, remained in total ignorance on the subject! A basis, if historical basis is required for the Millennium, would more readily be furnished by the fact that a thousand years elapsed between the founding of Solomon's temple and the coming of the Saviour. But whatever symbolical ideas may anywhere underlie the chronology of the Bible, it is plain our author has failed to account for the 1656 years before the flood on the ground of Ezra's responsibility; nor does it seem any way confirmatory of his view, that "the 1656 years are composed of twenty-three Pleiades periods of seventy-two years." Any dates whatever may, by aid of such super-terrestrial guesses, be taken out of the region of ordinary history.

It will readily appear, from the mode adopted by our author in dealing with the years before the flood, that no great weight can be attached to his acceptance of the common date affixed to the birth of Shem, although, singularly enough, he terms it "the starting-point of provably historical chronology." The date may "coincide with the taking of Babylon by the Medes, in 2458 B.C.," though sad havoc would be made in that case with the story of the flood and the building of Babel long afterwards; but the question is naturally prompted as to the reason for the difference between the genealogies before the flood and those from the flood to Abraham. Why should the one be rigidly historical if the other is necessarily mythical? Probably the safety of Bible chronologists will be found in adventuring upon no date earlier than the time of Abraham.

It is only, however, what might have been anticipated when, in regard

to later events, such correspondences are ascertained to exist between Scriptural facts and the stone-records of nations with which Israel was brought into contact, as almost to justify the statement, that "from the chronology of the Hebrews follows the satisfactory result that the contemporary reigns of kings of Israel and Judah with kings of Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt, as required by the Bible, can all be reconciled."

Patient research and accurate exegesis will both be needed before "all required synchronisms are proved." It is in the latter of the two qualifications Mr Bunsen mainly fails. To prove that our Lord was fifty years of age rather than thirty, by the statement, "forty-and-six years was the temple in building," as if the reference were solely to His own body, will hardly carry conviction; neither will multiplied references to the Rechabites establish the hypothesis that Psalm cx. "refers to the promise made by divine command to Jonadab, the patriarch and Lord of the Rechabites;" and as little will it be granted that, "like David, the Messiah was to be a non-Hebrew, a stranger in Israel."

*A Commentary on the Proverbs; with a New Translation, and with some of the Original Expositions Re-Examined in a Classified List.* By JOHN MILLER, Princeton. London: James Nisbet & Co.

This bulky volume, containing more than 650 pp. of compact letterpress, is one of the most peculiar productions in exegetical literature that we have ever had the fortune to meet. Alike in style and matter, it is characteristic and original. Seeing that it is a contribution from the other side of the Atlantic, the presence of a considerable number of Americanisms is not inexplicable. But in addition to this, the author allows himself a license in the use of words and metaphors which is often somewhat startling. As a whole, there is about his language an abruptness and ruggedness which, for the most part, is merely odd and inelegant, but nevertheless is at times striking and effective. He possesses vigour of imagination and diction, but uncontrolled by taste and discrimination.

The contents of the book are quite as unique as the style. Indeed, his interpretation is nothing if not original. In the first sentence of the Introduction we are told that nearly one half of the texts have received an entirely new signification. This surprising result is ascribed to the fact, that while his predecessors interpreted the book without any comprehensive conception of its nature, he himself started with a true and invaluable theory of it. First of all, he holds that there can be no commonplace in Proverbs. This he deduces *a priori* from Solomon's rank, supernatural wisdom, and inspiration, and further from the very nature of a proverb, which must be wise. Next, he maintains that every verse has a spiritual sense, for there can be nothing secular in Proverbs any more than in any other part of Scripture. Finally, the Proverbs are nowhere merely strung together, but each section contains a connected and consecutive line of thought. Following out this plan, he interprets the whole book as an allegorical exhibition of great spiritual truths. All the characters and relationships and objects of daily life are brought before us, not in their secular meaning, but as representatives of spiritual

states and things. Regarding the author's idea as radically wrong, we do not naturally place a high value on his elaboration of it. He displays great ingenuity in following it out, but his interpretations are throughout forced, and sometimes painfully so, *e.g.* chapter xxiii. and xxxi. 1-9, which last he regards as a prophecy concerning Christ. Still at times he succeeds in putting particular points in a happy way, and sometimes (*e.g.* chapter xxx. 18–20) manages to extract the sense more accurately than has been done by commentators of much higher general reliability. The book contains a great number of striking thoughts strikingly though ruggedly expressed, and, if we could only believe with Mr Miller that these spiritual truths were meant to be expressed by the respective proverbs, we should have been able to say more in praise of his work than merely that it is, in our opinion, a vigorous but far-fetched attempt to spiritualise the Book of Proverbs in a fashion that will be welcome to those who have a taste for that sort of thing, but which was not dreamt of at the time the Book was compiled.

## New Testament Exegesis.

*A Grammar of the New Testament Greek.* By Alexander Buttmann. Authorised Translation, with numerous Additions and Corrections by the Author. Andover: Warren F. Draper, Publisher. 1873.

The translator of this work, Mr J. H. Thayer of the Theological Seminary, Andover, introduces his preface by expressing the hope that this English reproduction of a German grammatical treatise may not be regarded as superfluous labour. We cannot doubt that the modest expectation will be amply fulfilled, and that Mr Thayer will find his efforts to bring this careful composition into use among English students cordially welcomed and thankfully acknowledged. For this is a book of sterling value, and one which occupies a place altogether its own in the important line of inquiry which it prosecutes. A notable contribution was made to the facilitating of the study of New Testament Greek in our country when the Messrs Clark of Edinburgh issued in 1870 a new version of Winer's Grammar, vastly superior to any which had been offered previously. In launching that laborious undertaking, the learned editor, Mr Moulton of the Wesleyan College, Richmond, stated that he had endeavoured to incorporate into Winer as many of the leading positions of Buttmann as possible, for the express reason that it seemed so unlikely that the latter would find a speedy translator. The translation almost despaired of then, has appeared with unexpected promptitude. Its appearance marks the second great contribution made to these investigations in recent years, and cannot but be eminently satisfactory to Mr Moulton and all interested in such studies. British scholars are apt, not without good reason, to complain of the ignorance of standard English books displayed by most German writers in the several departments of theology. Too often, however, the complaint may be met with a Roland for our Oliver, and conspicuously so in the present in-

stance. It is strange that a work which has been accepted as of great and independent merit in the land of its production, which has been used for the last dozen years at least very largely by the most distinguished German exegetes, and which has called forth the hearty encomiums of authorities like Tischendorf, should still be so little known as it seems to be in this country. To the best of our recollection it is passed over, for example, without so much as the barest notice in such a book as Mr Webster's *Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek Testament*, which professes to gather up in a reliable and convenient form the best results of the inquiries of leading scientific writers. Very curious is it also to observe the unlooked-for judgments occasionally pronounced by English scholars on the great German publications in their own field. The author to whom reference has just been made, Mr Webster, endeavours elaborately to depreciate Winer, but surprises us at the same time by eulogising Schirlitz in an uncommon strain. But, notwithstanding the excessive cumbrousness of the book, it is vain to detract from Winer's signal merits. Schirlitz's *Grundzüge der Neutestamentlichen Grätcität* has some good points. Yet it can lay no claim to anything at least like novelty or independence, its best parts being little more than repetitions of Winer. While, with respect to the treatise at present before us, Mr Moulton expresses a verdict quite within the truth when he declares it to be the most important work which has appeared on the Grammar of New Testament Greek during the last fourteen years.

All Greek students are familiar with the name of Philip Buttmann, and with the worth of his various works—his *School-Grammar*, his *Intermediate Grammar*, his *Lexilogus*, and many others. Constructed on a scientific plan pre-eminently their own, and executed in the freest spirit of original inquiry, that great scholar's Grammars of the classical Greek have had the singular fortune of being carried through a multitude of editions, and of still standing their ground, now some eighty years after their first issue, alongside those of Madvig, Kühner, and Curtius in Germany, Jelf and Donaldson in Britain, and Haven and Crosby in America, which have rendered most of their predecessors antiquated. Thoroughly accepting his father's scientific principles, and led to give the most patient attention to his whole method by his engagements in preparing successive editions of his father's Grammars, Alexander Buttmann, the worthy son of a worthy sire, conceived the idea of doing for New Testament Greek what had been so well done for classical Greek. In order to secure the leisure necessary for so great an enterprise, he was content to resign important offices which he held in Potsdam, and the Grammar now translated is the fruit of his self-chosen retirement. It appeared simply as an appendix to Philip Buttmann's work, and the peculiar form in which it was thus cast tended, no doubt, to set it at a disadvantage with those who were not accustomed to the system to which it was meant to be a supplement. Its value, nevertheless, was very quickly recognised in Germany, and whatever obstacles (which were neither few nor small) this particular connection with a single antecedent system created in the way of its introduction among

English students, all have been successfully overcome in the present edition, which offers, under every section, all the materials requisite to secure an adequate understanding of the author's positions on the part of those who may have no knowledge of the older work. The way, therefore, now seems open for its wide acceptance among ourselves.

It may be regarded as a necessary and very helpful complement to Winer. The two treatises should be used together, and in some respects the smaller and later excels the larger and earlier. No grammarian gives heartier praise to Winer, and none is more entitled to give it with authority, than Buttmann. For his own book he claims only a secondary place, and almost unduly exalts that of his forerunner. No one, however, has more clearly or more fairly pointed out Winer's infirmities, and precisely where Winer is weak Buttmann is strong. One evident defect in Winer's treatise is the bewildering mass of details. There is often such a heaping up of learned refutations of long exploded theories and references to now valueless and forgotten books, pamphlets, or essays, that it becomes difficult to obtain a definite grasp of the author's own principles and findings. It is also a decided drawback that he has chosen to deal at such needless length with the laws of classical Greek. His book is not so much a discussion of New Testament Greek, as rather a treatise on the entire grammar of the Greek language with a consideration of the New Testament usage included. Again, it aims too much at accomplishing on a large number of texts the work of the exegete as well as that of the grammarian. It is pervaded also by an undue assertion of the classical vein preserved in the New Testament language, and by an unwillingness to admit and guage the departure of the Biblical diction from the old standard. In these and other matters in which Winer fails, Buttmann succeeds. His book is remarkable for a precision and a conciseness which make it impossible to misapprehend his great positions. It is emphatically and strictly, too, a discussion of *New Testament* Greek. Passing by, as not demanding particular treatment, the broad and well-known characteristics of the classical forms, he concentrates his attention upon the language and usages of the sacred writers, and thus conveys a clear and vivid idea of what that diction is, such as we shall with difficulty carry off with us from Winer. He also most freely acknowledges the divergence of this idiom from the old model, explaining the great influences—such as the circulation of the Septuagint, the mixed composition of the then popular speech, the presence of Latin elements, and the creative power of the new doctrines of the Gospel—at work in modifying the ancient tongue. Whether the author's verdicts on these questions may or may not gain universal credit in every instance to which they are applied, his scientific recognition of the departure of the New Testament Greek from the classical type, which forms one of the most prominent characteristics of the work, deserves to be taken as one of the weightiest contributions it makes to our knowledge of the language.

The conclusions to which Buttmann comes on many of the nicer points of scholarship are at variance with those of his predecessor. But not unfrequently they will approve themselves as correct. His judgment

seems sound on the controversy respecting the *telic* and the *ecbatic* ἵνα. As Ellicott allows what he designates an occasional *subtelic* force to that particle, so Buttmann holds that often the idea of *purpose* recedes into the background, and the conjunction indicates simply a reference to something *future* and yet to be realised (p. 238). Winer again denies that the Aorist is ever used in the New Testament to express what is *habitual*. Buttmann, on the other hand, rightly points out that this denial requires explanation and qualification, in so far as the employment of the so-called *Gnomic* Aorist for the statement of general propositions, applicable not only to the past but also to the present and the future, must be allowed. He appears to be right, also, in affirming, as against Winer, the occurrence of αὐτός as a simple nominative without the emphatic sense of *self*. For valid reasons, too, he refuses to follow even so high an authority as Bernhardy in attempting to carry Dawes's famous canon through the syntax of the New Testament books. The slightest portion of the treatise is that which deals with Greek forms and inflections. But in the syntax, where of course the formative influences of the new truths of the gospel were most felt, the author's strength appears. Here the student will find very much to supplement and qualify Winer. And here so many matters are set in a fresh, clear light, and so many questions receive a new and eminently independent settlement, that it is perhaps not too much to claim for Buttmann a superiority over all who have gone before him in the discussion of some of the weightiest elements in the syntax of Biblical Greek. The only marked want which we are disposed to notice is seen in the omission of modern Greek with its laws and characteristics, the comparison of which might have helped this grammarian as well as others to account for various phenomena which otherwise must appear exceptional or inexplicable.

The English version has several advantages over the original. The indices are most careful, copious, and serviceable, embracing not only the New Testament texts, but also all relevant passages in the Septuagint. Along with these there is a glossary offering short, intelligible definitions of technical terms, such as the *anaphora*, *chiasmus*, *litotes*, *oxymoron*, *zeugma*, and other φωνᾶντα συνιέσι in which grammarians delight. It has also the special merit of containing between two and three hundred additions and corrections from the hand of the German author himself. The press-work, however, has not been so accurately accomplished as was desirable, a formidable list of corrected misprints being given in separate pages.

It is interesting to observe how a great exegete now removed from us, H. A. W. Meyer, expressed himself on the subject of the importance of these grammatical studies. Among the last of his formal addresses to the public was one confessing and deploring, on the part of theologians, the want of a "comprehensive and positive knowledge of Greek Grammar." The aged commentator was right. Grammar, no doubt, will not do all for the theologian. It is but the beginning. There are many things, especially in writings of limited extent, for the exposition of which we must look beyond mere grammar, to contextual considerations, the analogy of faith, interpretative tact, and common sense. Yet

grammar abides the basis of all. It will be well if theology recognises this, and acts upon it, not in mere sciolism, but in the spirit of a true and humble science. And to the best interests of a theology constructed on such foundations the present volume, rightly used, will be greatly helpful.

*The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans.* A New Translation, with Notes. By JOHN H. GODWIN, Hon. Prof. New Coll. Lond. Crown 8vo. Hodder & Stoughton. 1873.

Η ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ. *St Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* With Notes. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Master of the Temple, &c. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. Macmillan. 1873.

These two works are planned and constructed on a totally different principle. Professor Godwin, believing that the difficulty which has been found in understanding this Epistle has arisen, not so much from any statements of its own, as from inferences deduced from them, from the retention of obsolete terms, and the use of words with significations which they never have in ordinary discourse, has aimed at conveying the truths contained in the Epistle in "common phraseology;" and holding that the difficulties here and in other books of the New Testament "belong not so much to the language as to the subjects," and that these "are to be overcome by the exercise of Christian intelligence more than by learned criticism," he has set himself in this work to shew how far that may be successfully done. Believing that "the letters of St Paul, addressed to popular assemblies, would be generally intelligible without any comment, he has sought to produce a translation equally plain to those acquainted with modern English. The Notes have been written so that they may be understood by all readers." How far these objects have been attained we shall endeavour to indicate presently.

Dr Vaughan's work, originating as it did in the critical study of this Epistle with his elder pupils at Harrow School, first of all aims at precision in the interpretation of the Greek words and phrases of the Epistle. To secure accuracy in this, he has compared the use of the words and phrases here used, not only with that of the same words and phrases in the other writings of the same apostle, but in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha; and the long "Index of Greek Words explained or illustrated in the Notes"—between eight and nine hundred in number—is sufficient evidence of the pains bestowed upon this feature of his work. But Dr Vaughan's object was not to provide an exercise-book for Greek Testament reading, but to teach the Divine truth conveyed through the text which he so carefully sifts. "I desire (he says in the preface to his first edition) to record my impression, derived from the experience of many years, that the Epistles of the New Testament, no less than the Gospels, are capable of furnishing useful and solid instruction to the highest classes of our public schools. If they are taught accurately, not controversially; positively, not negatively; authoritatively, yet not dogmatically; taught with close

and constant reference to their literal meaning, to the connection of their parts, to the sequence of their argument, as well as to their moral and spiritual instruction, they will interest, they will inform, they will elevate; they will inspire a reverence for Scripture never to be discarded; they will awaken a desire to drink more deeply of the Word of God, certain hereafter to be gratified and fulfilled." This will give a sufficient idea of the scope and plan of Dr Vaughan's work, of which we shall speak more when we come to examine it in detail. In one thing both these authors agree—in discarding all reference to other commentators. Professor Godwin professes himself under great obligation to some of them, whom he names; but Dr Vaughan, if we rightly understand him, would almost indicate that he has studiously avoided even looking into any commentary in the study and preparation of this volume—a study extending over nearly eighteen years—"believing that to a mind educated in the study of ancient writers, and a heart disciplined to the pursuit of Divine knowledge, the Scriptures will gradually unfold their own meaning, as the reward of a patient and a trustful study. On the other hand (he says), if this process be interfered with by the premature presentation of the opinion of a human commentator, the clearness of the vision will inevitably be disturbed, now by a prepossession, and now by an antipathy, alike inconsistent with the spirit of calm and candid inquiry, and uncongenial to the very climate in which such processes should be carried on." We cannot quite admire this style of procedure, nor do we envy the spirit of self-reliance which ventures before the public with a commentary, even though only in the form of "Notes," in which everything done by preceding labourers is studiously ignored. He who will say that, long and laborious as his own studies have been on this portion of Scripture, the labours of others—who may have bestowed much more time and labour on it than himself, and not less scholarly and devout than he—would have done nothing to shake, to modify, or to enlarge his own views of any part of it, is not the sort of person whom, in this respect, we should care to copy.

But to come to these works in detail, and first to Professor Godwin's. We cannot say that we were prepossessed in its favour by the announcement, in the preface, that he proposed to substitute modern phraseology for those terms and phrases to which the Christian ear had been for long ages habituated in expressing the ideas of the Pauline Epistles. Experiments in this direction which we had seen before were not encouraging, but we thought it possible Professor Godwin might succeed better. Whether he has done so, we shall let our readers judge for themselves by a few specimens of his translation. Premising that for "Gospel" we have invariably "Good message;" for "righteousness," when it means "justification," we have "rightness"—the term "righteousness" being retained when it denotes inward personal excellence; for "unrighteousness" (ἀδικία) we have "wrong-doing," and for "offences" (παραπτώματα) "wrong deeds;" for "wrath," as an affection of the mind (in God), we have "indignation;" for the expression of it, "punishment;" for "condemnation" we have "adverse sentence;" for "to him that worketh" we have "to one doing service," and for "without works" we have "apart

from services;" for "the flesh" (whether spoken of Christ or of men) we have invariably "the lower nature," let us see how the translation reads, in a few cases:

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, appointed an apostle, having been set apart for God's good-message, which He before announced by His prophets in holy scriptures, respecting His Son,—born from David's family, as to the lower nature; marked out to be God's Son in power, as to the Spirit of holiness, by a rising up of the dead,—Jesus Christ our Lord; through whom we received favour, and a mission for the obedience of faith among all the Gentiles on account of His name,—among whom are you also, appointed to be Jesus Christ's,—to all in Rome who are beloved of God, appointed to be holy, Favour be to you, and prosperity, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ" (i. 1–7). . . . "And God set Him forth a mercy-offering through faith with His blood; for an exhibition of the rightness which is from Him, on account of the passing over the sins of former times by the forbearance of God:—for the exhibition at the present time of the rightness which is from Him, that He should be righteous, and judge to be right him who is of the faith of Jesus. Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what law?—of the services? Not so; but by a law of Faith" (iii. 25–27). . . . "Who was given up on account of our wrong deeds, and raised that we might be judged to be right" (iv. 25). . . . "But is it not as with the wrong deed, thus also with the effect of Favour? For if by the wrong deed of the one, the many die, much more the favour of God and the gift by favour,—by that of the One man Jesus Christ,—is abundant for the many. And is it not as through one who sinned, so with what is given? For the act of judgment was, from one wrong deed, to an adverse sentence; but the effect of favour, from many wrong deeds, to a declaration of right" (v. 15, 16).

We leave these specimens of translation to speak for themselves. The only question of interest about them is, What is gained by the adoption of such phraseology? Most readers, we think, and those who have studied this Epistle the most, will answer, Not much—perhaps rather lost. Take the one case in which there may seem to be some gain—the adoption of one English word, in its various forms, to express one very important Greek word in its many forms—"right" and "righteous" (for δίκαιος); "rightness" and "righteousness" (for δικαιοσύνη); to "right," "set right," and "judge to be right" (for δικαιοῦν); "a declaring of rightness" (for δικαίωσις), and "a declaring of right" (for δικαίωμα, v. 15, 16). Even here two English forms are required for one Greek one—"right" (in law) and "righteous" (in character), and so, "rightness" and "righteousness." If it be said, Even with this drawback, is it not better than to be obliged, as in our present version, to use "righteous" and "righteousness" in both senses, and again to "justify" and "justification," in which the mere English reader sees no relation to the other words? The answer to that is, that the resources of the two languages, though in many respects equal in richness, are not so in all respects. In some cases English is richer in forms of the same word than Greek, but here it happens to be the reverse; and things which cannot be perfectly conveyed in equivalent forms in both languages must be left for explanation by the expositor.

But matters of translation are of small moment to the substance of

the work ; and if we could speak favourably of that, we should overlook innovations in language, which, even if they make things little if at all clearer, do no harm if they only convey the sense of the original. It is with deep regret, however, that we must speak most unfavourably of several of the views conveyed in the Notes, touching even the vitalities of Christian truth.

1. Mankind inherit nothing from Adam but the death of the body. "Death came down through successive generations, being hereditary. This is said of death, not of sin ; and it is said only of bodily death. The death of men is declared to be a consequence of the sin of Adam, but nothing is said of the origin of sin ; so also subsequently, when the consequence of the sin of Adam is stated, only death is mentioned, vers. 15, 17. If both sin and death came to men from Adam, why is this said only of the latter?" (p. 131). Is not this naked *Pelagianism?* But Professor Godwin leaves us at no loss as to what he means to teach. In a supplemental note to chap. v. he thus speaks :

"The relation of the sin of Adam to the constitution and condition of all men is made in some systems of theology fundamental to all right views of the Gospel, and of the moral government of mankind. [In what orthodox system of theology is it not?] Nothing can be more different from this than the place which the subject has in the Bible. Besides the historical account of the commencement of sin and death, there is no reference to the subject in the Bible. There is not the least allusion to it in the words of Jesus Christ. . . . It is commonly supposed that the moral nature of Adam was at first different from that of his descendants ; but this is not taught in the Bible . . . The whole conduct of Adam and Eve is exactly like that of their children, shewing no superiority of nature. From the history of the fall in the garden of Eden, we learn that wrong-doing and misery are not the results of unfavourable circumstances, but the consequence of a want of faith in God. Only by this faith can frail and dependent creatures preserve innocence, continue in what is right, and attain to moral perfection. The sin of Adam is by some supposed, without any authority from Scripture, to account for human wickedness, and to be the reason for the punishment of mankind. But the sins of men can no more be accounted for by their constitution than his sin can be," &c. (pp. 142–144).

2. In the death of Christ there was no substitution of the Innocent for the guilty, and He did not pay the penalty of sin, nor endure anything in our stead, but only for our behoof.

"The sacrifice of Christ (says Mr Godwin) was offered *unto* God, and was acceptable to Him, not for the suffering that was there, but for the goodness that was there. It was offered *for* men, on behalf of men ; and it is effective in them for the same reason—for its perfect goodness—because it is the highest manifestation of the strongest faith in God, and the greatest love to men. . . . Punishment, so far as it is the *necessary* consequence of sin, can be prevented only by the removal of sin, and must cease when it is taken away. But punishment, so far as it is the *appointed* consequence of sin, may rightly be averted by whatever is more effectual than punishment in preventing wrong, and promoting right ; with this justice is fully satisfied, whether human or divine" (pp. 91, 92). "The question has been much discussed by theologians, Why was the death of Christ necessary for the remission of punishment? But this is not the problem given in the Bible. We are taught that it

was the proper way for the complete salvation of men, and not that it was necessary to vindicate Divine justice in sparing the penitent. Heb. ii. 10" (p. 85).

3. On the Person of Christ there is not one unequivocal statement throughout the whole book, that we have observed, of His supreme Divinity. On the words "His Son" (i. 4), the note runs thus: "Jesus, the offspring of Mary, the descendant of David, is called the Son of God (Luke i. 35). He was this, not with reference to merely human attributes, nor on account of relationship, nor because of anything of human origin, but with reference to the spirit He possessed and manifested, and because of the operation of the Divine Spirit which preceded His birth, was always present in Him, and was communicated by Him" (p. 6). We look on to the note on the next clause—"the Spirit of holiness"—but nothing unequivocally expressive of Personal Divinity occurs there. From chapter to chapter we advance, hoping that in some pretty decisive passages something more definite might crop out, but find nothing. At length we turn to chap. ix. 5, in which the sense given in our Authorised Version is by the best scholars held to be the only tenable one—"of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever"—there Mr Godwin's version is, "From whom is Christ, in that which respects the lower nature. God who is over all be praised for ever." And the note is:

"*Lower nature* (τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, i. 15). He was born of David's family, as to this i. 3. The higher nature of Christ [what is that?] is certainly suggested by this reference to the lower nature, as the description of those who were Paul's kindred by nature (v. 3) implies that he had kindred of a higher order. But the expression of what is suggested is not required in either case. The apostle here mentions only what was peculiar to the Jewish people, and therefore any further statement respecting Christ would be unsuitable. He had a special relation to the Jewish nation in respect to what was natural; and as the son of David He was from them. But He had no special relation to the Jews in respect to what is spiritual: and as the Son of God, He was not from them. The statement of what had been given to the Jewish nation is surely a proper occasion for the following doxology, since, though some were without faith, the favour of God could not be in vain. Many, both Jews and Gentiles, would be saved. . . . The apostle begins and ends the consideration of this subject with the ascription of praise to God—*to Him who is over all—to Him, of whom, by whom, and for whom are all things*" (xi. 36)—*over all* (ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός). *One Lord, one faith, one baptism: one God and Father of all, who is over all* (Eph. iv. 6)—*be praised* (i. 25). "*The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ knows,—He who is to be praised for ever,—that I do not speak falsely* (2 Cor. xi. 31). The participle ὤν is not superfluous (i. 7), but makes the reference to the universality of the divine government emphatic, as the emphatic *all* in the concluding doxology (xi. 6). The relative pronoun, which would connect what follows with what precedes, as in the common translation, is not used here, ὅς ἐστι (i. 25; v. 14). In doxologies the term expressing praise, εὐλογητός, commonly precedes, on account of the emphasis; but here the description has properly the first place, being emphatic, and referring to the preceding statements (Ps. lxvii. Sept.). The common punctuation, being merely a matter of criticism, has no conclusive authority. The absence in the New Testament of any similar expressions in respect to

Christ is adverse to the common connection of these words with the preceding. As a doxology, it properly follows the enumeration of Jewish privileges, and leads to the following statements respecting the faithfulness of God" (pp. 251–253).

[We have no space to reply to this criticism, in which only writers of extreme theological opinions concur.]

We do not for a moment insinuate a doubt as to Professor Godwin's orthodoxy on so vital a point as the supreme Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. But surely such a work should not have been so constructed that the reader of it should be unable to gather from it what definition its author would give of that "higher nature" of the Lord Jesus which is the key-stone of Christianity. Nor is it any defence of this want that in the strict exegesis of this Epistle it was not "required," and would have been "unsuitable" (p. 252). In parting with this volume, we are constrained to say, that if the views expressed by Professor Godwin on the Fall and the connection between Adam and the human race, on the one hand, and on the other, on the nature of the sacrifice and atonement of Christ (we should be sorry to add, on the Person of Christ, save in a negative sense), should rule the future ministrations of those Highbury and New College students, "with whom this Epistle was often read, and who wished that the observations offered to them should be preserved and communicated to others," they will do what they can to blot out from the great denomination to whom they belong that Puritan theology which has hitherto been its bone and muscle, its strength and glory; and further, that even though in point of doctrine their teaching should be unexceptionable, should they be unwise enough to adopt those modern forms of expression which are here exemplified and recommended, in place of the old, familiar, rich, and expressive phraseology, their ministrations will lose all the sap, and be shorn of all the attraction to sin-stricken souls, which made Nonconformist pulpits what they were in their best days. Nor in this warning shall we be without the sympathy of not a few of the best ministers and members of that body, who, as we have occasion to know, have been for some time "doubting whereto this" new-fangled style of teaching and preaching "will grow."

Our space is exhausted ere we have approached Dr Vaughan's work in detail. It is not everybody's book, nor every clerical student's book. It is for those who can set themselves, with a measure of sympathy, determination, and perseverance to the minute phraseological study of the Epistle, as the basis of all thorough apprehension of its teaching. Almost every word and phrase is analysed, its origin and usages traced and exhibited with a combination of neatness and terseness very rare, and profusely illustrated by parallels from other parts of the Greek Scriptures. In precision of rendering, there is rather a tendency to excess; but one must remember the training purposes for which such studies were designed, and after all, it is by much the better side to err on, if an error at all. In the midst of all this effort to bring out every shade of thought suggested by the phraseology, it is easy to see, and refreshing to feel, that all is subservient to the conveyance of the pro-

found truths, the great evangelical verities, the rich spiritual views unfolded in this Epistle. Everywhere one feels that he is in the hands of a reverential and thoroughly sympathetic expositor, sitting at the feet of the greatest of the apostles in this his master-piece of Divine teaching. Not that we go along with him either in all his criticism or in all his expositions—that could hardly be expected—but this much we cannot but say, that not only in perhaps all that involves real scholarship do we concur with him, but precisely on those points of deepest moment, where a firm footing, a clear note, and a tone befitting the subject are most to be prized, there it is that Dr Vaughan pleases us most.

*Introduction to the Pauline Epistles.* By PATON J. GLOAG, minister of Galashiels. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 8vo. 1874.

*The Pastoral Epistles. The Greek Text and Translation. With Introduction, Expository Notes, and Dissertations.* By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Principal of Free Church College, Glasgow. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Crown 8vo. 1874.

It is pleasant to see Scotland coming to the front in fresh contributions to the criticism and interpretation of the New Testament. English and Scottish minds have each their peculiar type, and it were a pity to lose the benefit of either. In the end of last century and beginning of this, Scotland took the lead in this walk, and Aberdeen stood foremost. Dr Macknight, indeed, in the south, had before that time issued his voluminous "Commentary on the Epistles," and his "Harmony of the Gospels," by which exegetical study was undoubtedly stimulated. But the Commentary was very unsatisfactory, as well critically as theologically. At Aberdeen, however, while Dr Campbell, of Marischal College, was issuing his great work on the Gospels, by which he added to the renown he had acquired as the antagonist of David Hume, Dr Gilbert Gerard was delivering at King's College that course of Lectures on Biblical Criticism which he afterwards published—the first work of the kind, so far as we are aware, in the English language, and though defective and now entirely superseded, not without considerable merit for the time. Some fifty years ago, the late Dr John Brown, then only pastor of a Secession Church in Edinburgh, awakened a fresh interest in New Testament criticism by a class which met in his own house for the study of the Pauline Epistles; and such was the influence which he thus acquired in his own religious body, that it created a Chair of Exegetical Theology, and appointed him as its first Professor. The works which Dr Brown issued from the press, as the fruit of these studies, and of his pulpit use of them, are well known. Dr Eadie, his successor, has worthily sustained the interest in exegetical study already awakened, and his Commentaries on the Greek Text of the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Galatians, are an evidence of the care and success with which he has dug in this mine. In the Established and afterwards in the Free Church, Dr Fairbairn long stood almost alone in Scotland (with the exception of Dr Forbes, now Professor of Hebrew in the University of Aberdeen) in the earnest prosecution of

Biblical study, and his published works have done not a little to turn the current of theological inquiry out of an almost exclusively systematic into a more Biblical channel. His most recent work, which we shall presently take up in detail, is in his own congenial line; and though, as originating in a course of pastoral teaching, the higher purposes of the pastoral office are chiefly in view, the canonical authority of these Epistles is carefully sifted, in the light of recent attempts to undermine it, and the Epistles themselves are interpreted on strict principles of criticism, both textual and exegetical. Dr Gloag, though coming more recently into this field, is well maintaining the credit of the Established branch of Scottish Presbyterianism. His previous works, and his contributions to this *Review*, would prepare those who were acquainted with them for something valuable in his present work, and it will not disappoint expectation, but rather exceed it.

To begin, then, with this "Introduction to the Pauline Epistles," Dr Gloag is perhaps right in saying that there is no English work pretty similar to his own, except Dr Davidson's earlier and later Introductions to the New Testament. For Horne's Introduction, in its reconstructed as well as in its older form, takes a much wider range, and other able Introductions to particular books of the New Testament are to be found only in the Commentaries to which they are prefixed. Such a work, therefore, as Dr Gloag's, if well executed, and embracing the requisite matter, ought to be a useful manual for those who would know something of the literature of this division of the New Testament, and obtain the means of weighing the many questions that have arisen out of it, but who may have scanty access to the principal books, and perhaps be unable to read some of them; and it gives us pleasure to say that Dr Gloag's book will fulfil that object. The most recent literature of his subject is before him, and he handles it with ease and skill. Along with a full statement of the facts and opinions regarding each Epistle, he gives an essay on the chief points of controversy raised by them respectively. For example, on the question, Whether our Canon embraces all the Epistles which the apostle wrote? he dwells at considerable, we should almost say undue, length—deciding, as we think rightly, in the negative. On the style and matter of the Pauline Epistles, the remarks, though sensible, might have been improved by something of that grasp and that subtle apprehension of the elements of power in the great apostle, which strike one in the dissertations of Professor Jowett, to whom Dr Gloag so often and properly refers, and which make one grieve to think how far the whole supernatural and saving elements of Christianity have been dissolved in his mind through the application of what is falsely styled "the higher criticism." The two Essays on "Paul's Views of the Advent," and on "The Man of Sin," in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, are entirely to our mind. In the latter Essay, after a fair statement of the opinions entertained at different periods of what is meant by "The man of sin," and the difficulties attaching to each of them, the author comes to a conclusion, which, though now regarded by many good writers as antiquated and untenable, is, in our judgment, open to less formidable difficulties, and meets more of the conditions of the question than any other—that it points to that apostasy from apostо-

lical Christianity which, though already working when Paul wrote, was precluded from revealing itself in its concrete form until the removal of the seat of Empire from Rome, and the subsequent fall of the Empire itself, when it hasted to step into the throne of the Cæsars, and reconstructed the Empire in an ecclesiastical form, subduing all Roman Christendom to one "Man" seated on the seven hills and claiming divine prerogatives, while throwing the spell of a sensuous Christianity over its votaries, the better to consolidate its spiritual despotism—an accursed system to be overthrown only by the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and the brightness of His coming. The Essay on "The Factions" in the Corinthian Church is a good statement of the theories on that much controverted point in which the Germans delight, but in their treatment of which there is more of laborious trifling than anything else, in our judgment. On "The Lord's Supper and the Agapæ," the author had a fine opportunity for going to the root of some great Eucharistic questions which are again rising into ominous importance, but he has contented himself with explaining how the abuses complained of by the apostle originated. On "Paul's Theological Terms," in the Epistle to the Romans, such as "righteousness," "faith," "flesh and spirit," there are some excellent remarks; particularly on the supposed threefold division of human nature into "spirit, soul, and body," and other like attempts to extract a scheme of mental philosophy out of the Bible. But we must protest against the assertion that the distinction between the moral and the ceremonial branches of the law of Moses was unknown to the ancient Jews—in the face not merely of the general strain of the book of Deuteronomy and similar portions of the Old Testament, but of such decisive passages as 1 Sam. xv. 22, Prov. xxi. 3, Hos. vi. 6, Mic. vi. 7, and Mark xii. 33. And more strongly yet must we protest against the assertion that the apostle identifies the moral law or the Mosaic law with "the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2), which the context is said to favour. The treatment of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians is full, and the replies to the attacks made on these Epistles by the sceptical critics are good. But we could wish that there were less of a half apologetic tone in such replies. We refer here, not to the treatment of the external evidence, which must be investigated on critical principles, but to those pretended internal evidences of a later hand in these Epistles which only reveal the total want of spiritual insight in the critics themselves—their entire incapacity to apprehend the deeper principles of Christian truth, and, not to speak of the want of spiritual apprehension, a style of criticism which would destroy the credit of some of the most authentic ancient literature which we possess. We cannot follow Dr Gloag through the rest of his work. Suffice it to say, that to younger clergy and students entering on the critical study of these Epistles with any adequate furniture, this work will be found a trustworthy guide, and raise its author's reputation in this important branch of biblical study.

Dr Fairbairn's work on the pastoral Epistles is a most valuable addition to our too scanty stock of such works. The Introduction goes less into minute detail than Dr Gloag's, the whole object of whose book

is Introduction. But there is a pleasant vigour and compactness about it; and while overlooking nothing of consequence in the arguments of Schleiermacher, Baur, and other critics of the sceptical school, there is what one feels the want of in some defences of the disputed books, a refreshing firmness of tread and outcome of good common sense. For example, on the use of words and phrases in these Epistles which are not to be found in the acknowledged Epistles of Paul, and are alleged to be unpauline, Dr Fairbairn well says, that the really testing questions would be such as these: "Does any term occur in the Pastoral Epistles which was not in use when the apostle lived? Or, are words used in senses which were not acquired till a later time? Or, finally, are these terms of thought and expression not appropriate or natural for the apostle to have employed in the position actually occupied by him, and with reference to the ends for which he lived? Such questions would be strictly relevant, and if capable of being answered in the affirmative, would be fatal to the genuineness of the Epistles. But nothing of such a description has been established" (pp. 14, 15).

We are glad to observe the care which Dr Fairbairn has bestowed upon the *text* of these Epistles—a department of criticism of which the majority of our clergy know nothing at all, but which will by and by demand more attention. While the text of Tischendorf's eighth and last edition is adopted, as most nearly coinciding with what the author judges to be the correct one, it is not slavishly followed; for twice it has been adopted with hesitation (in the former case, as we judge, wrongly,[1] in the latter, very properly), and once with a formal dissent—a good reason why he should, instead of adopting, have rejected it in favour of the received and clearly the genuine text.

A new translation of any portion of the New Testament must be prepared to encounter, from Bible-loving Englishmen, the same sort of prejudice as new versions of the Psalms from Scotch Presbyterians. It is desirable, therefore, that every attention should be paid to those qualities which will alone give such efforts a chance of general favour—namely, adherence to the Authorised Version as far as possible consistently with fidelity, and, where that requires it to be departed from, as much as possible of that terse simplicity, purity, and rhythm which constitute such a charm in our present version. Dr Fairbairn's translation of the Pastoral Epistles might be thought not to need these qualities, not being offered as a contribution towards that work of revisal which is now going on at Westminster, but simply as an aid to a better understanding of the text, and a necessary accompaniment of the Epository Notes. Be it so; but since the plan was adopted of prefixing to the notes a new translation of the text, it was surely desirable that the conditions of an acceptable and agreeable version, such as would tell favourably on ears accustomed to our present versions, should be observed. And they have been to some extent, though scarcely enough, we think. In several places the Authorised Version has

[1] The faulty Greek construction here adopted by Tischendorf and our author seems to us to be an early corruption of the genuine text. In the very next verse the proper construction is found, and the parallels adduced to justify it are not strictly parallel: if it is genuine here it stands alone in the New Testament.

been departed from, where nothing whatever is thereby gained, and modernisms have been in some places needlessly introduced. "Who only *hath* immortality" should not have been changed into "Who only *has* immortality." In 2 Tim. iii. 1, the unbiblical word "however"—(This know, *however*)—might have been avoided. In 1 Tim. iv. 6, where our version has "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things," which perhaps is scarcely exact enough, we have a phrase quite alien from Biblical English, and far too modern to be agreeable here—"By submitting these things to the brethren." Surely, "If thou put (or set) these things before the brethren" might have sufficed (for the participial form is not needed to bring out the obvious sense). In 1 Tim. iv. 11, the rendering "Charge these things, and teach" is not English; for though when *persons* are meant, "charge" is the best rendering, where *things* are intended (as here) "command," as in the Authorised Version, is alone suitable. It was right, perhaps, to mark the distinction between τέκνον, "child," and υἱός, "son," at the opening of the two Epistles to Timothy—"To Timothy, mine own," or "my true *child*," and "To Timothy, my beloved *child*," thereby emphasising at the outset that endearing relationship. But to continue that word further down, "This charge I commit to thee, *child* Timothy" (1 Tim. i. 18), is surely a mistake, and one which we see Ellicott avoids. (We suppose it is by an oversight that Titus is addressed as my true *son*, though the word is τέκνον, i. 4.) One more rendering we notice of a different kind:—"For there is one God, one Mediator also, between God and man, [a] man, Christ Jesus." Now, first, it was a pity to sacrifice the English idiom to the Greek. In English we do not speak of a mediator "of" two conflicting parties: "*between* God and men" is the proper English, as in our own version. But more objectionable is "[a] man, Christ Jesus," which suggests to the English ear what is not correct, that our Lord was merely an individual man. What our author aims at expressing is the important fact that in the designation of our Lord to the mediatorial office, His "manhood" was expressly provided for. But if this is to be conveyed in English, it must either be by some such phrase as "Christ Jesus [himself] man," or if that is objected to, as our own and all previous English versions except the Rhemish does—"the man, Christ Jesus." (The Rhemish has simply, "Christ Jesus, man.")

But though we have made these somewhat small criticisms, no one is more sensible than the writer of this notice how much easier it is to detect imperfections in a new version of any portion of the New Testament, than to execute the same task well. And we now gladly come to the "Expository Notes," as they are modestly called. Of these we have nothing to say but in the way of commendation. The ripe wisdom shewn in the handling of the various topics which these Epistles bring up for consideration is as great as the exegetical accuracy with which the sense of each statement is investigated and expressed. It is difficult to give examples where so many might justly be given. But we may refer to such bracketed paragraphs as that on "How far Christian ministers should in their preaching disclose their more marked personal experiences, or should interweave references to their spiritual history with their manifestations of divine truth to their fellow-men" (pp. 99, 100). The subject of

women teaching in public, and all that is said of women in 1 Tim. ii. 11–15, is admirably handled. The view given of that much controverted verse, 1 Tim. v. 17, is, we have no doubt, the correct one, and the subject is treated with much judgment. The same remark is applicable to what is said of "the deposit," 1 Tim. vi. 20; of the alleged diminution of the Apostle's confidence in Timothy between the writing of his first and second Epistles to that attached son in the faith, and of the time predicted when men "would not endure sound teaching, but with itching ears would heap to themselves teachers" (2 Tim. iv. 3). We emphatically approve of the whole view given of the offices mentioned in these Pastoral Epistles—we refer to that of ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβύτερος, εὐαγγελιστής—more satisfactory than the treatment of the same terms by Dr Gloag (to which, however, in the main we do not object).

No two critics can be expected to agree as to the precise sense of every phrase and term in three such Epistles as these; and if we differ from our author in some places, this has in no degree diminished our sense of the real value of his present work. The word χάρισμα ("gifts of grace"), fourteen times used in the Pauline Epistles, and only once elsewhere (1 Pet. iv. 10), "*always* means an endowment or gift of grace bestowed by the Holy Spirit *for some special ministration or official service*" (p. 188.) But this cannot be alleged in view of Rom. v. 15, "But not as the offence [of Adam], so also is the *free gift*" (of justifying "righteousness in Christ"), where the word has certainly no reference to any special ministration or official service of Christians or Christian ministers. Tit. i. 1 is thus rendered: "Paul, a servant of God, also an apostle of Jesus Christ, for the faith of God's elect," instead of "*according to* the faith of God's elect," as in the Authorised Version. Now, notwithstanding what Ellicott, followed by Alford and our author, says in defence of this meaning of κατά, we have no hesitation in saying that this sense of it would never have been thought of but for an imaginary difficulty in the apostle's statement, according to our version—as if it implied that "the faith or knowledge of individuals was the rule or *norma* of the apostle's knowledge" (Ellicott, *in loc.*)—whereas all we understand the apostle to say is, that his official teaching and "the faith of God's elect," were entirely accordant.

These, however, are but examples of such difference of opinion in the interpretation of Scripture as may be expected of any two earnest students, and the statement of which only helps to aid the studies of others. On the whole, we can desire nothing better for any young pastor than that he should set himself to a systematic study of these Pastoral Epistles, with this book constantly by him, and that he should write out from time to time his own thoughts on the leading topics and ideas suggested by the text and by Dr Fairbairn's exposition of it. In so doing he will, if we mistake not, find increasing reason to value its general accuracy and wisdom. We have no space left to notice the three Dissertations in the Appendix, the second of which will be found full, carefully wrought out, and, as we judge, satisfactory.

*A Popular Commentary on the New Testament.* By D. D. Whedon, D.D. Vol. I. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1874.

Messrs Hodder & Stoughton have done a service to the large public who are non-professional students of the Bible, by publishing this work on this side of the Atlantic. Dr Whedon is an American expositor connected with the Episcopal Methodist Church. The first volume before us contains the first two Gospels. The authorised version is used (unfortunately not in paragraph, but verse divisions) as the text, and the notes fill nearly the whole of every page. They draw largely from such writers as Alford, Stanley, Thomson, &c., in elucidation of geography, antiquities, and the like; but follow only too closely Hengstenberg on Old Testament citations. Allowing for the Armenianism of the author, which is not obtruded, the theology, so far as developed, is orthodox; and there is a judicious combination of practical religious lessons with strictly exegetical explanations. Sometimes we find inelegancies of style, and here and there a too slavish adherence to American authorities, where these are not the latest or best. For example, he quotes Robinson's note as to the date of our Lord's birth, based on Ideler, and does not name Wieseler. He accepts, too, the insertion of Joachim's name in the genealogy (Matt. i. 11) on the slenderest authority. But though not always quite trustworthy, the book is, in point of scholarship, a decided improvement on its predecessor, Barnes, and a welcome addition to our stock of helps for the English reader. The Harmony prefixed, though divided like both Robinson's and Gardiner's into nine periods, does not adopt the same points of division as they, but what seems to us a far more natural and real arrangement, following the stages in the inward development of the Lord's ministry.

## Miscellaneous.

*Facta non Verba; A Comparison between Catholic and Protestant Charity in England.* By the Author of "Contrasts." W. Isbister & Co. London. 1874.

The amount of effort made at present all over England for the relief of poverty and ignorance is little known even to the English themselves, much less to other nations. Protestantism has always been misrepresented by Popery as alike godless and selfish, and we have held our peace, and been, perhaps, too indifferent to the charge. In some respects, indeed, where Popery has been unjust to us, we have been more than just to Popery. There are few devout Englishwomen, perhaps, who do not think with a sort of tender awe of the life of a nun, or who can resist the ideal romance of the convent school. The seclusion and the quiet are so different from the open freedom and bustle of our family life and public class teaching, that we fancy a grace and beauty where they do not really exist. We have been in the habit, too, of listening with meekness to the assertion of Roman Catholics, that the system of teaching, of nursing,

and of dealing with poverty generally, carried on by their conventual establishments, is so superior to ours, that we have nothing to do but hide our faces in shame and confusion. A book which should go thoroughly into this subject, collecting statistics on both sides, and pointing out what was really worthy of imitation, would be a great boon in these times, when England seems in danger of drifting into feeble imitations of what may not after all be so admirable, if, indeed, she do not at last ignorantly accept the worse reality. The book before us scarcely answers this end. In facts we think it is as correct and impartial as it is interesting, but in its deductions it is somewhat vague and inconclusive, and leaves the question of superiority a little doubtful after all.

Is England an uncharitable nation? Its splendid universities, its immense hospitals, its numerous charity schools and almshouses, its eager subscriptions to sudden distresses at home or abroad, all answer, No. Such occasional contributions to foreign famines, war desolations, and sicknesses, are unknown to continental nations; and we may safely compare our voluntary charitable and educational endowments with any which Popery has wrung from the terror and remorse of dying-beds. How, then, have we failed to organise our work so as to make it tell upon the community, both as regards the helpless and the helped? It is at this point that our author has done good service. He has endeavoured to shew that Protestantism can touch the distress and poverty of its humbler members, and can reach by its freer action deeper into the disease, and higher towards its cure. Leaving aside our public charitable institutions, he takes what is purely woman's work among the poor and miserable. In eleven most interesting sketches, he tells of Miss Rye and Annie Macpherson, who have rescued hundreds of street arabs and gutter children, and placed them in happy homes beyond the Atlantic; of Johanna Chandler's and Miss Gilbert's work among the epileptic and the blind; of Mrs Hilton's *crèche;* of Mary Carpenter's and Mary Whately's mission work at home and abroad; of Sarah Robinson's temperance efforts among soldiers; of Adeline Cooper's working-men's clubs; and the nursing schools of Mary Merryweather. And he asks: "Had these ladies, the brief sketch of whose lives and labours I have given, been the inmates of a convent, no matter how well organised, and under a set of rules drawn up by even the most liberal-minded priests, could the result of their labours have been greater, or have conferred more honour on the country of which they are natives, or the religion which they profess? Had they chosen St Mary Alacoque as their model instead of Dorcas, the 'woman full of good works and almsdeeds which she did,' their devotion could hardly have conferred greater benefits on mankind, and would certainly have been less intelligible."

It is no easy task which these noble women have imposed upon themselves. It is no light work to encounter the poverty, dirt, and degradation of great cities; and we are inclined to think that the results of their work will compare very favourably with mere Roman Catholic organisation for doing the work. This organisation is their chief boast. It must be confessed that women with few family ties are best fitted to go where infection is to be encountered, where ample time must be given, and

entire devotion to the work must be the mainspring of their life. That we might learn something from our Roman Catholic sisters in this direction we are willing to allow; but the deadening, degrading effects of Romanism itself are manifested by the following contrast:

"The reader, if he has resided any time in Paris, may have noticed at night a number of men and women employed about the streets, who but rarely make their appearance in the day time—the chiffoniers and the valageurs (the latter the scavengers of Paris). They are, as may be imagined, of the poorest of the Parisian population. It might be considered, from the nature of their occupation, that considerable affinity existed between them; but this, however, would be a most erroneous conclusion. It would be difficult to find two communities holding more antagonistic principles. The chiffoniers are certainly honest, so are the valageurs, but there their similarity ends. The chiffoniers, both men and women, are drunken, quarrelsome, and filthily dirty in their habits. The valageurs are sober, industrious, and well-conducted, it being a very rare case for one to come under the notice of the police. The chiffoniers are to a man Catholic, the valageurs to a man Protestant. Singularly enough, the two principal colonies of these communities are in the same *quartier* of Paris, separated only by a couple of streets. Any locality more filthy than that inhabited by the chiffoniers it would be impossible to imagine, nor any more cleanly and well-ordered than that of the valageurs. The latter have their schools, partly maintained by themselves, and partly supplemented by charitable contributions, besides their chapel and benefit funds. Few would imagine, from their cleanly appearance on the Sabbath, the unpleasant nature of their ordinary occupations. Their divine service, too, is admirably performed; and the singing of their hymns (many of which date from the days of the Huguenots) is more than creditable. A number of Parisian ladies and gentlemen (Protestants) take this community under their protection, and work together as energetically and as perfectly without scandal as in our English Protestant institutions. The chiffoniers, on the contrary, with the exception of occasionally a Sister of Charity or Mercy plying her womanly work, have none, or few of the better classes to visit them, and their dwellings and institutions are, for dirt and demoralisation, a proverb in the mouths of Parisians."

*Journal of Henry Cockburn; being a Continuation of the Memorials of his Time.* 1831–1854. 2 vols. Edmonstone & Douglas. 1874.

Lord Cockburn's "Memorials" was a book of gossip: his "Journal" is a book of history. There is good history in the Memorials, and there is some capital gossip in the Journal; but still this is the true distinction between them, far more than the fact that the Journal continues his life from 1830 onwards. The present, at least, is a book of national interest and value.

Yet of fine confused gossipy "feeding" in it, we recall, as we close it, his description of Coruisk, of Lord Pitmilly's legs in the wet streets of Stirling, the delicious remembrance of "Dear Scott! the plain dress, the guttural burred voice, the lame walk, the thoughtful heavy face with its mantling smile"; the *fac simile* of a page of Chalmers' shorthand notes, stolen by Cockburn after a speech which made him "shed tears of pure admiration"; John Dunlop, whom every one loved, but who "in appear-

ance was exceedingly like a little, old, grey cuddy"; and the last entry in the diary, with the repose of death creeping through every line of its wonderful description of the bay of Ayr. But as we open the volumes again, five hundred other points catch the eye. And occasionally they are summed up, as when in 1836 he crushes into a paragraph a description of the "astonishing intellectual fermentation" of that busy time, and in 1847 looks back and reviews his century. "A wise man," he says, "would like to have seen the past age, but to live in this one." Then besides the social, there are the political and the legal histories of progress, both full of biographical interest and of shrewd generalisation. But we leave them all for the ecclesiastical, into the strong tides of which the calm lawyer is gradually and reluctantly drawn, confessing at last that they contain the highest contemporary history of his country. And if ever a book was *felix opportunitate*, it is one which comes out exactly when the old coil it records has come up, after thirty years' repose, for readjustment, or at least for judgment on appeal.

Lord Cockburn was a Scotch Whig, having therefore the possibility of sympathies with the Kirk, but tinged a little at first with the irreligious tone which characterised some of the earlier years of the *Edinburgh Review*. In 1833 he records the proposal of the Veto as following upon "the first serious attack in modern times on patronage," and, as on the whole right, being the "least dangerous scheme that can be suggested." But he then thought the "wild party" worked it injudiciously, there being an "Evangelical race between them and the Dissenters." The collision came in 1838 on the Auchterarder case. Cockburn says the object of the judges in giving what he thought a wrong decision legally was "to preserve patronage: I wish they may not have ruined it." But he adds, "The Church will be on fire at the *principles* avowed by some of the judges." And accordingly this opened the new chapter, in the famous Assembly of that year, which refused in the meantime to suspend the Veto Act, and issued the "Declaration of Independence." "All this," says Cockburn, "I think quite right," on constitutional principle; though he adds, with emphatic italicising, that Tory and Radical "concurred, *when they were not religious*, in their condemnation of the measures of the Assembly." Cockburn himself all through this book avoids looking at things from a religious standpoint, and his testimony from the purely legal side is made more telling by the reluctance with which it is given, and by his often falling back on the maxim that "the Church no doubt must be subject to the law, and to the law as delivered by the Courts." On the bench he often held the same warning language, but when driven to decide deliberately on cases of absolute collision with the "law as delivered by the Courts," *e.g.* the deposition of the Strathbogie ministers, he acknowledges frankly, that *if the Church be independent*, refusal to obey is legitimate. The issues of all this the Churchmen foresaw much more clearly than the lawyers, and Cockburn's education in the matter on the Scotch Bench (and by far the weightiest lawyers who sat there at the time agreed with him in his views) is very curious. "The practical result" of the Court's actings "is, that as a separate and independent power, the Church is altogether superseded." "We have now (1842) in

Scotland a thing called a Church. . . . This newly discovered legal Church may be the best of all possible Churches, but it is not the Church which any one Scotchman believed he had adopted." This "utter annihilation of the *Church*" as an independent authority, Cockburn had found in the principles of the early judgments, and in the later he traces the applications of it in the more extreme decisions both on patronage and on the admission of *quoad sacra* and Original Secession ministers to the Church. These applications he is very indignant at, holding them to go beyond even the Erastian principle which had regulated the whole, and he predicts, "groaning for the Court of Session," that these more offensive injunctions and interdicts will at some time be retreated from, or at least will not be held a precedent for ordinary cases. But it was about the "principle" the Church had to deal, and that not with the Courts, but with the Legislature. Moderation on the part of the Courts might have postponed the decision, and the abolition of patronage or the expulsion of the *quoad sacra* ministers might have avoided it for the time; but the principle of the decisions remained, and the course the thing took brought swiftly together all the elements of a final and tragic catastrophe. Cockburn gives only the legal side of this: the "hurrying steps" of the other actors in the concluding scene one hears better in the more massive work of Dr Buchanan, long ago the mover of the "Declaration of Independence" of 1838, and now the sole survivor of the grand events "*quorum pars magna fuit.*" Our judge indeed refers for the Church's Claim of Right to Dunlop's great State-paper itself, adding, "Whenever history shall try to describe these events, that paper must be its guide and its mine. It is the essence of the whole story." But thoroughly as it sums up what he had previously come to hold as the constitutional fact, Cockburn cannot help adding, "It may seriously be doubted whether ours be a Church that is now compatible with a connection with the State." This suggestion was before the Disruption, and immediately after it he starts the idea of union among the non-established Presbyterians, stating the difficulties with great accuracy. "The only obstacle is, that most of the old Dissenters are now Voluntaries, whereas all the members of the Free Church have hitherto thought, not merely that our Establishment was expedient, but that its erection was the duty of the civil magistrate. This principle, however, will abate under disestablishment; and though Voluntaryism prevails among other Dissenters individually, it is not one of their standards as a religious community." After the crisis of 1843, however (when the Church sacrifice for once melts Lord Cockburn into pure and unrestrained sympathy), he relapses into his position of general but genial criticism.

The great defect of the book and of this discussion is that it is too purely Scotch. The question which so fascinated Cockburn was one not national, but world-wide: the churchmen partially apprehended this, but the lawyers did not, and hence even when a strong brain and heart like this reaches the true conclusion, it has not formula adequate to express it. He laughs at Lord Medwyn for quoting Gelasius in the Auchterarder case on a "mere question of Scotch law:" but Cockburn's own admissions before he is done prove that the Church question was not a mere

question of Scotch law, but of those divine or human rights which limit the operation of all civil law, and in discussing which the learning of no age is without its use.

*The Art Teaching of the Primitive Church.* By the Rev. R. St John Tyrwhitt, M.A. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is to be congratulated on having enlisted Mr Tyrwhitt among its writers. No one in England, with the single exception of Mr Ruskin, has written on art with such fulness of knowledge and grace of style as Mr Tyrwhitt. The present volume required, however, another qualification besides love for art; and even those most jealous of art in the domain of religion will be satisfied with the sound and cautious principles laid down by Mr Tyrwhitt. Fond as he is of artistic beauty, religious truth and edification are still dearer to him; he will not consent to sacrifice their more sacred claims to any other. He maintains, as we believe with perfect justice, that art may be used in the service of religion. He truly says, "The teaching of our Lord by spoken parable involves His sanction to instruction by painted parable and allegory, which is virtually the same method." In another place he says with not less truth, that the rude symbolic pictures of the vine or of the pastor bearing the lost lamb—so common among the remains of the ancient church—are simply picture-writing of the words, "I am the True Vine," or "I am the Good Shepherd." Such pictures, however, were symbolical, and not representative. Their object was to impress a certain Personality and a certain truth upon the beholder's mind; but they did not profess to give a correct representation of how He looked. Safety is only secured, Mr Tyrwhitt maintains, in religious art, when this rule is made absolute, namely, that pictures shall be symbolic, not representative. He adds, that religious painting ought at its best to be a kind of artistic preaching, a proclamation of truth in Christ. "And if there has been true desire of the glory of God in the painter, it will somehow be felt by the spectator; he will understand, that is to say, that a man gone before him has devoutly sought to serve God by his art; and that feeling ought to be the chief value, if not the chief beauty, of the picture to him." In days when we hear so much of the adoration of the sacrament, it may be interesting to read Mr Tyrwhitt's view of the real character of this practice:

"There is," he writes, "a kind of Pagan's Progress from the sign of Divine Attribute to the *fetiche* or image worshipped for its own sake. It has been too often made even in the Christian church, and it may be observed in full completion in our own days. It seems to belong to all religious systems in which a caste in any form are definitely and absolutely separated from the people."

This book will be found simply delightful by all who have any interest in the art teaching of the primitive church, and even those who have rather an objection to art teaching altogether, may relax somewhat of the

severity of their views if they can be persuaded to put themselves under the guidance of a teacher so judicious and so intelligent as Mr Tyrwhitt.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

*Church and Home Lessons from the Book of the Prophet Hosea*, by the Rev. A. C. Thiselton, Dublin (Nisbet & Co.), is a practical popular exposition, written with evangelical earnestness, of a portion of Holy Writ seldom studied for pulpit use so carefully as by the author. A book of thoughtful and really able sermons on the parable of the talents (Matt. xxv.), is entitled *Stewardship of Life*, by the Rev. James Stirling, of the City Road Congregational Church, London (Hodder & Stoughton); but we marvel at being told that the unprofitable servant "entered on the heirship of his own causations," and that his soul "discharged on itself its arrowy war." The Rev. Adolph Saphir, in *Christ and the Church* (Nisbet & Co.), gives ten sermons on the *Apostolic Commission* (Matt. xxviii. 18–20), in which we have another specimen of his interesting preaching, peculiarly rich with Scripture illustrations and comparisons, which do not appear on the surface, but are seen when uncovered to be as real as they are beautiful. We refer our readers for one instance out of many to his remarks on Babel, p. 360. *Apostolic Times and their Lessons*, by the Rev. C. H. Ramsden, M.A., vicar of Chilham (Hatchards), is what it professes to be, a series of "plain practical readings from the Acts of the Apostles." We welcome heartily Mr Lupton's continuation of his translation of the works of Dean Colet. The volume on Romans we noticed at length in a previous number. The present volume, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (George Bell & Sons), contains the Latin original, Mr Lupton's accurate version into English, and a paper on Colet's writings and opinions. The commentary does not only deserve a place in the museum of past hermeneutics, but will be found helpful to the present study of the epistle. *The Analytical Introduction and Notes to the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by the Rev. W. A. O'Connor, B.A. (Longmans), has the same brevity which we remarked on in his volume on the Romans, with its consequent suggestiveness in parts, indeed, but unsatisfactoriness as a treatment of this important epistle.

A kind of book exceedingly useful for promoting a knowledge of Scripture, so wofully deficient even among regular attendants at worship, is represented by *Texts and Thoughts for Christian Ministers*, by Bishop Harding (Longmans), and *God's own Testimony to Prayer*, by J. J. Wood, D.D. (Edinburgh: Maclaren & Macniven). In the latter all the prayers of Holy Scripture and their answers are collected, with brief notes appended; and in the other, every text bearing on ministerial work will be found, accompanied by remarks.

*Sermons*, by the late Robert Lee, D.D., are eminently readable. There

is neither dullness nor strained oratory in them. They are thoroughly practical; but they lay no adequate foundation for right practice. They insist forcibly on the blessings of goodness; but the moving power is, we may almost say, ignored. It is as if St Paul had begun his words to the Romans at the twelfth chapter. In all the writings of the Rev. J. C. Ryle we expect to find sound gospel teaching, and we are not disappointed in this as we examine the pages of *Knots Untied, being Plain Statements on Disputed Points in Religion, from the standpoint of an Evangelical Churchman* (W. Hunt & Co.). But we cannot say that the book answers the promise of its title-page. He strives, of course, to bring the Prayer-Book into harmony with his own scriptural doctrine, but he fails. When discussing the statement regarding regeneration in the baptismal service, for instance, he says, that if these assertions are to be taken for more than a *charitable supposition* (italic in original), it will throw the whole Prayer-Book into confusion. We submit that this is to leave the "knot" still tied. If this is all that one of the best of the evangelical clergy can do to unloose it, he had better bruise his fingers no more, but cut the priest-knotted bond manfully with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. *Gratuitous Redemption*, by the Rev. B. Charlesworth (Nisbet & Co.), is a memorial volume of the author's long ministry of forty-three years.

Of books intended to stimulate to Christian devotion and work, we have *A Book of Meditations*, by the Rev. Edward Collett (Bemrose & Sons), *The King of Love* (Isbister), and *Chief Women; or, Higher Life in High Places*, by Mrs Gordon *neé* Miss Brewster (W. Hunt & Co). The two former are for closet use. The last contains earnest addresses to the ladies of the "unworking classes," by one of themselves, to come over to the Lord's side.

*At Home with Jesus*, by Caroline A. Godfrey (Hunt & Co.), gives brief and loving memorials of a good man, John C. Reichardt, missionary to the Jews. The *Life of Dean Alford*, by his widow (Rivington's), formerly noticed by us, is in its third edition. The *Memoir of Thomas T. Lynch*, edited by William White (Isbister), is a fitting memorial of a man whom we cannot always agree with, but whom we always admire and love. We wish to forget that there ever was a "Rivulet Controversy," and therefore we would rather introduce people to the attractive Theophilus Trinal by his works than by this life, although it is a good one, and all who have been helped by him (their name is legion) should read it. We are glad that the erection of a statue to Bunyan by the Duke of Bedford has induced the Rev. James Copner, vicar of Elstow, to publish *The Hero of Elstow*, or story of the pilgrimage of J. Bunyan (Hodder & Stoughton). The history of his life is clearly and well written.

Messrs Clark send us the sixteenth volume of Dr Schaff's American edition of Lange's "Old Testament," which contains the minor prophets. As in former volumes of this important work, American scholars, in translating from the original German *collaborateurs*, have considerably enlarged the commentary by additional matter, which is partly new, and partly taken from English and continental sources. Besides this, the closing prophets—the post-exilian—are not from the German at all. Lange's original series of Commentaries has not yet overtaken these; and Dr

Schaff has supplied the omission by the aid of three American theologians, who, however, have followed as closely as possible the manner of Lange's staff, already well known to our readers. Dr Elliott's General Introduction is a great deal too general. Attempting to embrace the whole subject of Old Testament prophecy within a few pages, it becomes too slim to be satisfactory. But the volume, as a whole, ought to be of use to ministers and students who have not access to the literature of these difficult portions of Scripture.

We have also received the second volume of Keil's "Jeremiah," as part of the first issue for this year of Clark's Foreign Theological Library. The other volume of this issue is Professor Christlieb's important work on Apologetics, which we notice elsewhere.

We are glad to see that this valued series of foreign works is about to include two books of such acknowledged excellence as Lathardt's "John," and Oehler's "Biblical Theology of the Old Testament."

# BRITISH AND FOREIGN
# EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

## OCTOBER 1874.

### ART. I.—*Capabilities of Presbyterianism.*

OUR special purpose is to inquire into some of those capabilities of Presbyterianism of which the full development has been hindered by internal but remediable causes.

We wish not to commit the mistake of overrating the importance of a particular form of church government. We know that the Divine Spirit is free to use what means He pleases for the extension and preservation of vital godliness, or to dispense with means altogether. We do not forget that the saintly and beneficent lives which put us to the blush in the records of the past have belonged to almost every section of the Church of Christ, and that the triumphs of the Gospel in heathen lands have taken place under almost every form of church organization. We know that not even the worst form has availed to shut out the Divine Spirit from access to individual men, nor the best to secure His efficacious working. This cannot be safely forgotten in any studies on the government of the Church. Nevertheless the fact remains, that the Church is Christ's institution; and every blemish or defect in her organisation must be attended with some injury to herself, and with loss of power in her mission to the world. During times of spiritual revival, an impression is apt to prevail that forms of church government are absolutely indifferent; yet at such times the importance soon becomes felt of having the

churches in such a state as to furnish holy homes for the affections of young believers, and outlets for their loving energies—wells also ready dug to receive the early and latter rains of blessing, and channels to spread the fertilizing influence over the face of the world. We do not suppose that the Church of Christ can attain its best state, or exercise its highest influence, without the best government and administration. These must, indeed, on earth always fall short of the divine ideal; yet each branch of the Church may, in its asymptotic path, approach ever nearer to Heaven's perfect line; and every such approach will benefit not itself only, but the Church universal, and help forward the subjugation of the world to Christ.

An author of the English Broad-School[1] has recently remarked:

"Amid the confusion of the sixteenth century, Presbyterianism exercised a sort of fascination over the minds of a great many good and even able men." Yet he affirms that it is "the offspring of one man's overconfident brain;" that "confronted with Scripture, it breaks down at all points;" and that "confronted with history, it appears to be an unheard of novelty." He also characterises it as an "impracticable system, which unites the faults and misses the advantages of both Episcopacy and Congregationalism alike;" so that, "confronted with the ordinary facts of human life and of the world—not as they ought to be, but as they actually are—in England, within a century, it utterly broke down and disappeared; in Scotland, its adherents have split up into two or three irreconcilable fragments; in Ireland, it is thought to be preparing for transformation into a moderate Episcopacy; in France, it has never succeeded in gaining one inch of ground since the great religious wars; and in Geneva itself it is reported to have lost all hold over a community which is at present equally divided between Socinianism and Rome."

Beyond making these and a few other naked assertions, this author has not, however, ventured to grapple with the Presbyterian argument. He has prudently directed his extended criticisms against the far more vulnerable systems of the prevalent forms of English dissent. Yet such assertions as these will be useful if they lead Presbyterians to give closer attention to the scriptural foundations of their own system, and to discriminate between its essential and its accidental features, so as to hold the latter with a loose hand, while firmly

[1] *Dissent in its relation to the Church of England;* Bampton Lectures. By George Herbert Curteis, M.A.

grasping the former; and at the same time to seek the correction of any practical blemishes which have given to such charges whatever plausibility they possess.

Were it true that Presbyterianism is unscriptural, it would present a strange historical phenomenon; for assuredly the founders of the Presbyterian Churches professed and meant to deduce their principles of government from the Word of God alone. We need not assume, neither do we think, that it is the only form of church government which possesses some divine features; any more than we think or assume that the divine ideal is fully represented by it as embodied in the constitution of any existing church. Enough if we hold it to be not merely in its intention "founded on the Word of God," but in its general principles actually "agreeable thereto." That all believers are Christ's freemen, and priests to God; that the ministry of the Word is the most important function, and therefore the highest office, in the Church; that government and pastoral care are the especial duties of the Church's elders; and that the divinely constituted relationship between all Christians creates obligations of communion and mutual supervision which cannot be confined within the limits of particular congregations, but ought to be extended as far as God gives opportunity;—these are principles as scriptural as they are Presbyterian, and which cannot be abandoned at the instance either of Episcopalians or Congregationalists. But if these be conceded and secured, we need not be solicitous either about the name by which they are known, or about the particular arrangements by which any church on earth has sought to give effect to them.

Were there truth in Mr Curteis' additional assertion, that Presbyterianism is an impracticable system, that also would be a stumbling fact; for a system "founded on God's Word and agreeable thereto," must bear the impress of divine wisdom, and possess preeminent capabilities, in so far as it is faithfully carried out, of fulfilling the ends for which a Church exists. We believe that it does possess these, and that it has practically proved its possession of them. Mr Curteis' historical statements, above quoted, are in part defective (he has not even alluded to the growth and strength of Presbyterianism in the United States of America); in part grossly exaggerated; and in part irrelevant, because he ascribes to

Presbyterianism itself what, in France especially, and largely in Scotland, has been due not to it, but to the hostile interference of the powers of the world. In whatever measure it may seem to have anywhere practically failed from internal weakness, the failure has been due, we think, not to Presbyterian principles rightly understood and acted on, but to the misunderstanding, exaggeration, or undue restriction of them.

Presbyterianism is often spoken of as occupying a middle place between Prelatic Episcopacy and Congregational Independency, or—measuring from the extreme positions—between the externalism, sacerdotalism, and spiritual despotism of Popery on the one hand, and the overstrained spirituality of Quakerism and anarchy of "Unattached Christians" on the other. Its claims are thus supported by the proverb that "truth lies in the middle." A questionable proverb, however; for truth does not always lie in the middle. Certainly it does not rest there. At the best, it is negative truth that does so. Of positive truth—truth that can act with power on the world—it must be said, as Pascal has said of the truly wise man, that it "touches both extremes and fills the space between." A church which should attempt to rest complacently in the middle, without extending her influence over the whole field of human life, would soon find herself forestalled by extreme men and churches on all hands, doing the good she neglected or was unable to do, and so winning men's sympathies everywhere away from her. But if animated by the living and loving Spirit of Christ, the Presbyterian Church, from its middle position, ought—in direct contrariety to Mr Curteis' description—to avoid the faults and unite the real advantages "both of Episcopacy and Congregationalism alike," —its catholic and expansive principles fitting it to touch the circumference of man's spiritual necessities and of the Christian life all round.

We think it evident from a consideration of the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, as we have endeavoured to state them, that those blemishes of the extreme systems which she has been charged with uniting, while native to them, are to her accidental. If Episcopacy has generally tended towards sacerdotalism, this has been by no accident, but because the prelatic bishop, finding himself promoted from the ministry of the Word to an office supposed to be higher, is tempted to

seek the justification of his new position, is indeed almost necessitated to find his *raison d'être*, in the imagination of a function more important than that which Paul accounted his highest work, the preaching of the gospel (1 Cor. i. 17[1]), and in ascribing to himself an officially transmitted power of sacramental grace. Holding himself also to be the centre of unity to his diocese, he naturally defines schism as revolt from his authority, and that authority becomes almost of necessity lordly. Ruling a number of congregations, whose individual members he for the most part cannot personally know, discipline in his hands becomes naturally lax. On the other hand, the Independent congregation, being constituted on the principle of voluntary association, and being ruled equally by all its members, is tempted to make its admission and exclusion of members to depend on the personal likings, prejudices, or, at best, spiritual experiences of its own clique or set, or to govern by a sort of club law rather than by a judicial administration of the law of Christ. Its discipline thus tends to become gossipping and inquisitorial. Presbyterianism, if only true to itself, and if the fundamental faiths on which it is based live in it, cannot fall into any of these opposite errors. Sacerdotal it cannot be, so long as it remembers its most important function to be the preaching of God's Word; for that Word, as open to its people as to any of its ministers, brings them into as direct hearing of the voice of Christ as it brings him; into as close contact with Christ's person, and into as immediate reception of His grace. It cannot be lordly, so long as its most intimate government is not exercised outside the congregations, but is in the hands of the elders of the congregations themselves. And its discipline cannot be lax, so long as its rule is the holy law of Christ; nor yet inquisitorial or arbitrary, so long as His written law is its only rule.

On the other hand, since it maintains the divine commission of the ministry of the Word as firmly as Episcopacy does, and gives it even a more honourable place, though not believing that either that commission or the grace of the Spirit by which it is to be rightly fulfilled, can come by official transmission, through the hands, it may be, of wicked men,—Presbyterianism

[1] "Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the gospel," a statement which seems to us conclusive as to the question, What is the highest function in the Church, and who, if any, are the successors of the apostles?

gives to its ministers (and those of them who approve themselves to be truly sent by God actually possess) an authority and an influence as great as any fallible men ought to have. Hence its solicitousness in general regarding the character and qualifications of its ministers, and its careful provision to ascertain the reality of their divine commission, both by their own solemn profession and public self-dedication, by the call of the Christian people, and by the strictest tests of their soundness in the faith. Indeed it may be thought that in regard to this last point, some of the Presbyterian Churches have exaggerated the requirements of Christian duty, by the imposition of tests more extended and minutely exact, and by terms of imposition more stringent, than the Master would approve of; incurring thus the twofold risk of lowering the Christian character by wounding the conscience of some whom they commission, and of excluding—as far as in them lies—from the Master's work some others (perhaps in our day many) whom He Himself has really sent.[1] But supposing it to be so, this is a practical mistake—quite remediable—not an error in fundamental principle; and it holds emphatically true that Presbyterianism is distinguished by the true place—of honour and responsibility without priestly character—which it gives to the ministry of the Word. So also it gives to sacraments their due place as seals of the gospel, committing the dispensation of them to those who preach the gospel, not as to a priesthood, but as a matter of propriety; and the result is, that nowhere are the sacraments—the Lord's Supper in particular—more solemnly administered, more truly enjoyed, or followed with more blessed results, than in some Presbyterian churches.

Thus constituted, assuredly the Presbyterian ministry needs never want dignity. If it has been seen to want it, this has, we think, resulted from a needless exaggeration of the principle of Presbyterian parity. In those days when civil rulers were

[1] This matter has been treated so recently and ably in this periodical, that we content ourselves at present with indicating our opinion that the practical confusion of the Church's *test* of office with her *testimony* has been injurious in many ways. The tacit assumption that the test and the testimony must be coincident in extent, nay, that the imposition of the one and the bearing of the other are one and the same act, seems to us to be a grand fallacy partially vitiating Professor Dunlop's otherwise admirable defence of our Presbyterian Creeds.

bent on introducing Prelacy, by force or by guile, into Presbyterian Churches, there was much reason to fear that the admission of any inequality between ministers of the gospel might be taken advantage of for that end, and that beneath the cap of a permanent moderator there might lurk the horns of a mitre. Nor do we say that a perpetual moderatorship of presbyteries is even now a desirable thing. But we do think that the aversion to it has been exaggerated even to superstition. The principle of Presbyterian parity has been caricatured by a principle of rotation, which places in the moderator's chair of every presbytery the unwisest and the weakest member equally with the ablest, holiest, and otherwise most suitable, so as at times to give rise to scenes the reverse of edifying. Such scenes, at a very early date, gave occasion to detractors to compare presbyteries to *burley* [boor-law] courts, and they still contribute to render Presbyterian government distasteful to some men of peace. Were eligibility to the responsible position confined to a few approved men, under every possible safeguard against a possible lapse into Prelacy, a holy and wise moderator, remaining subject to his brethren, but for the time the *primus inter pares*, might exercise both over the members of the Presbytery, and over the general community (including the highest ranks) within its bounds, an influence as real as, but far purer than, that of a so-called bishop. In so far as the tendency at present visible among certain classes in Presbyterian communities to drift into Episcopacy is due to an inclination for a religion of ceremonies, or to the frivolity of fashion, or to the disposition of the natural heart to rest in a system of external grace, it would be worse than weakness, it would be sinful, to endeavour to arrest the current by concession or compromise. Worship cannot be too spiritual. But it would be no less a weakness (to use the mildest term), were we, from the mere spirit of conservatism, or from a supposed obligation to deviate in nothing from the practice of our ecclesiastical ancestors, or under any imagination of a binding contract between Churches and their members forbidding the alteration of a jot or tittle of the letter of their constitutions, or under the influence of any other self-imposed fetters, to insist on rigid uniformity of worship in every congregation however circumstanced, or on a rigid adherence to ancient forms even when they are manifestly

unsuited to the times or offensive to modern taste. No church has a right thus unwisely to alienate from herself the affections and allegiance of cultivated men, or, without necessity of conscience, to prevent any Christian men from seeking her communion. She cannot do so *in the name of Christ.*

Again, Presbyterianism is fully capable of furnishing to its people all that many Christian men think they can find only in Congregationalism. There is nothing in the authority of the eldership unexaggerated and rightly understood, nor yet in the authority of the Church courts when unexaggerated, inconsistent with the enjoyment by private Christians and by congregations, of all the freedom of action which can be claimed for them in accordance with the law of Christ, or with benefit to themselves. The wisest Congregationalists have often acknowledged that absolute democratic government is not good, and their frequent practical evasion of it by the appointment of committees to do the work of church-sessions, as well as occasional proposals to exclude novices from a share in the government of their churches, shew some Presbyterian tendencies. Why then should the aristocratic views as to the eldership which grew up during the civil war, in polemical opposition to Congregationalism, excluding the Christian people from all share in the discipline of the Church except that of *obligatory* consent, still prevail to prevent us from going part of the way to meet them? If the elders are, as we believe, merely the more experienced and wiser members of the Church, those best fitted to exercise effectively the duties of mutual help and supervision enjoined in Scripture on all Christians towards one another, and who are, therefore, specially set apart as the representatives of the congregation to perform them, the minister, *qud* elder, being merely one of them, then their functions are pre-eminent rather than exclusive; and we see no reason in scriptural Presbyterianism why, under their presidency, the Christian people should not be admitted to some distinct share in discipline, as they actually are amongst the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales.[1] Neither is there in Presbyterianism

[1] Even in civil and criminal cases, in our own land, the people are not excluded. An accused man has the privilege of throwing himself for trial upon "*the country*," as represented by any twelve honest men; and we think that a proceeding analogous to this would, in cases of discipline, be perfectly competent in the Presbyterian Church.

any reason why members of congregations should not, under due regulation, be allowed a freer exercise of their gifts in public, after the manner lately shewn us by the American evangelists whose labours God has so richly blessed in our land. There is no reason, further, as the experience of some of the Presbyterian Churches abundantly proves, why, if God's law and gospel are preached in their pulpits so faithfully as to induce self-examination, and if discipline is administered so scripturally as to exclude or correct all who are evidently living lives unworthy of the gospel, they may not realise purity of communion as great as is attainable in this world. Finally, there is no reason in principle why those who desire still more select circles of intimate fellowship, may not form voluntary societies for the purpose, provided always they do not think themselves entitled, in so doing, to withdraw from the wider fellowship of the Church.

The Presbyterian Church holds the doctrine of the *unity* and *catholicity* of the Church. Because of her firm grasp of this principle (which so fascinates the minds of many, even when they see it only travestied in Popery) we believe she is fitted to be one of the chief instruments in realising the grand ideal. Perhaps what most "strikes a stranger" in her government, is the provision she has actually made for Church unity and united Church action, by her gradation of courts. In this men recognise her strength. Yet, strange to say, in this also they see her most conspicuous failures. They see that by this she has—in Scotland, for example, her peculiar home—exerted an influence which has made that country one of the most intelligently religious in the world, and filled its history with many pages of heroic Christian deeds. But they also see, that beyond a certain point this has failed to carry her, and that her ideal of unity has been miserably mocked by division after division, so as to lead men to seek its realisation anywhere but in her. Is High Church Prelacy, then, with its sacramental claims, rendering men dependent on bishops for needed grace, the true principle of unity, and is every prelate its local centre? Or if the idea of having as many centres of the one Church as there are prelates in the world is absurd, is that centre to be sought at Rome, and the unity to be realised in the subjection of the whole baptised world to the "Vicar of Christ," who has his seat there? We are driven back by

Scriptural principle from both of these hypotheses. Is the ideal, then, a chimera, as Congregationalists say? Is there no such thing as a catholic, a national, or even a provincial church, to be aimed at, but only particular churches worshipping in single buildings? We cannot admit this. We admit that the Church of Christ to which the promise of salvation is made is the spiritual Church of the elect of God who are now one in Christ by the baptism of His Spirit, and who shall one day be gathered visibly together in general assembly before the throne, and that the special promises to professedly Christian assemblies belong to them only in so far as they are truly Christian; but we believe also that Christians are bound continually to aim at visibility as a Church, even on earth. We think that, just as believers are gathered in practical fellowship into particular churches, so ought those particular churches to be united in practical fellowship into more comprehensive churches, and that the fellowship ought to embrace every Church of Christ in the world. No mere Evangelical Alliance, but a unity organic and authoritative, will accord with this, the Presbyterian ideal. Why, then, has it not been realised, even within the limited sphere of a national or a provincial church? Why has the history of Presbyterianism been so marred by secessions and divisions? Why do we see rival Presbyterian Churches holding no fellowship with one another in the same land, and why is it so difficult to re-unite them?

Doubtless there are various causes. Coercion from without has had much to do with it; a too frequently low standard of spirituality within has had much to do with it; scrupulosity and human infirmity have had much to do with it. But we think that an historical survey shews it to have been connected largely also with exaggerated views and with an excessive exercise of Church authority, which have been met by insubordination and revolt. Cases, we are aware, are to be found, in which the fault has lain very distinctly in the insubordinate spirit of seceding men; but in still more, the fault has been on both sides; and, perhaps in few, but for an overstraining of authority, would secession have taken place. It becomes important therefore to inquire, Whether the despotic action which has caused these divisions has been merely an abuse of legitimate authority, on the part of men

of domineering temper or unchristian spirit, or in part the result of a mistaken assumption, even by Christian men, of an authority greater than they actually possessed.

In order to answer this question, it becomes necessary to fix the relations of liberty and authority between Church courts,—we do not say as they actually are, but as they ought to be. It has been often asked, which is the fundamental court in the Presbyterian Church? and various answers have been given. In Scotland, where "the haill Kirk" met earlier than any provincial Synods or Presbyteries, and constituted these by its authority, the supreme court has been very generally held to be the fundamental one, and therefore to be competent to redress every wrong, and interfere in almost every arrangement of the courts below. In the United States of America, on the other hand, where the first Presbyteries arose apart from one another, and subsequently associated themselves into Synods and Assemblies, the presbytery has been reckoned fundamental, and the authority of the supreme court is much more limited. In the Scottish United Presbyterian Church, where congregations sprang up very much apart, the tendencies have been to much local independence. In the Free Church, on the other hand, which constituted itself in full General Assembly, the tendency has been somewhat more in the direction of central authority. The question, therefore, is by no means a settled one. Yet it is important. If the one view be true, then the authority of presbyteries so depends on General Assemblies, that all disobedience is sin, and that separation is necessarily schism; if the other view be the true one, then the higher courts are mere confederations, from which any one of the lower has a right to retire when it pleases, with or without sufficient assignable cause. The former view tends to ecclesiastical despotism; the latter, to presbyterial, if not congregational, independency.

We ask whether either of these views is right? The fundamental charter of Christian assemblies is, "Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them. . . . What ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." We know of no warrant to limit the application of this promise to any one kind of Christian assembly, or to refuse it equal application to the congregation, to the presbytery, to the General Assembly. "In Christ's

name" is the one attached condition. That condition, of course, implies that the persons assembled are true Christians, and meet in a Christian spirit; that the object of meeting is accordant with the revealed will of Christ; and that the powers exercised are warranted by the places or offices which the persons hold in the Church. But these conditions fulfilled, the little prayer-meeting of two or three believers, the Christian congregation met for the calling of a minister, the meeting of elders who have come together for the united exercise of discipline and government, the meeting of ministers of the Word in *colloquy* or presbytery for the ordination of a new minister, the General Assembly of a national Church met for purposes of national extent,—all meet equally by an authority derived directly from Christ, and which need not have come even ministerially through any other assembly. So the prophets and teachers at Antioch who separated Barnabas and Paul with fasting and laying on of hands, the council of the apostles and elders which assembled at Jerusalem to consider the great question of the relation of Gentiles to the Mosaic law, and the meeting of the Church at Corinth which excommunicated the incestuous member, asked no authority any one of them from the other; and yet all met and acted in the name and by the authority of Christ.

The question then comes,—In what relation of equality, or of authority and subordination, do greater and smaller assemblies, each holding immediately of Christ, stand to one another?

The answer to this question, we think, depends upon the principle, that the sphere of church authority is the regulation of Christian communion (in its various kinds), that communion is a thing of degree, and that the authority is proportional to the degree of communion. The more intimate the communion, the more intense is the authority; the more remote it is, the authority is weaker. Let us illustrate our meaning from matters of common life. Every family has a right to decide for itself whom it shall admit to stay in the house: this right is, under God, almost absolute; no other person or family has a right to interfere; even "the king cannot, the king dare not." But in matters of national concern, that family has but one voice among millions, and the king is supreme. In like manner, the members of a little prayer-meeting or fellowship-meeting have an almost absolute right to judge whom they

shall admit to join their circle: for even a true Christian might have views so peculiar that his presence would thoroughly mar the sweetness and profitableness of their meeting. Not so with reference to more public fellowship—for example, with reference to the question, whom I am to sit with at the Lord's Table? still less so with respect to more distant ecclesiastical relations, in which the spiritual interests of many besides myself are involved. Those general interests must be protected by some authority that embraces the whole field over which they extend. In like manner a congregation, with its minister, elders, and people, are far more intimately affected by the question of the fitness of a particular person to become one of their number than a presbytery is; while they are less competent to judge of the general bearing of the case on the religious interests of the district. So likewise a presbytery has a far deeper interest in the character of a fellow-minister who sits with them continually, than a General Assembly has of whom he forms but one in several hundreds, and few of whose members may even personally know him; whereas the General Assembly can better judge in questions of national concern, as well as of the bearings of local cases on interests of national extent.

The relation which we thus suppose between lower and higher church courts, finds an analogy in that which exists between the local and central governments of the United States, as lately settled by the sword, after nearly a century of divided opinion. It is now settled that neither the local legislatures nor the General Congress holds the one of the other, but all equally of the nation; that each State is independent in its own internal affairs, but not in those matters which affect the whole nation, or another State, or even a single individual in another State; in all which cases, as well as in foreign relations, supremacy rests with the central government and its courts. The Southern theory was that of confederation, and had a good deal to be said historically in its favour. But separation was like to be the result. Now that that theory is at an end, as far as human sagacity can see, there is no probability of new collisions, nor any discernible reason why a nation uniting so much local freedom with so much central energy should not permanently govern the immense territory which Providence has allotted it.

The history of the United States is by analogy a sufficient answer to the objection that such a relation as we suppose, between higher and lower church courts having rights on each side with which the other cannot interfere, must lead to practical conflicts. In that very possibility of conflict lies the guarantee for the due balance of authority and freedom. We know that in the British Constitution each of the three Estates has its prerogatives or privileges, of which it is itself the sole ultimate judge. This relation of things has doubtless led to collisions, some of them protracted and disastrous, and even within our own memories the Estates of the realm have been on the verge of collision: yet this co-ordination of rights is the very safeguard of British freedom, which would be compromised were any one of them to be made subordinate to the others. The prevalent spirit of patriotism has in general secured such an exercise of mutual forbearance, as has prevented actual disaster, and has on the whole issued in the happiest results.

We do not think that the principle has been recognised with sufficient explicitness by the Presbyterian Churches. Hence the *nobile officium* claimed by supreme courts has sometimes trenched on local rights, and on the liberty of conscience of members of the lower courts; while, on the other hand, these lower courts have sometimes carried their resistance beyond the point absolutely required by conscience—even to separation that was not absolutely necessary and therefore not free from the charge of schism. In practice, indeed, the supreme courts have for the most part been chary of exercising the whole power which they claim. This abstinence has often been due to Christian feeling; at other times it has been a mere matter of convenience. For example, the National Synod of the Reformed Church of France, after which our British Presbyterian Churches have been so closely modelled, found it necessary at an early date, for its own sake, to limit the amount of troublesome business from the provinces, by ordaining that no appeal should be brought up to it except on matters of general concern. It would have been well had this ordinance indicated an equally clear perception of the other side of the case—that the National Synod ought not (unless by way of counsel and aid) to interfere in those local matters except when they created a public scandal, or

otherwise affected general interests, and then only to the extent to which they did so.

Let us give some illustrations of the practical working of the principle in various directions: 1. A kirk-session, we shall suppose, refuses Church privileges to an applicant. He appeals to the presbytery, and the judgment of the session is reversed. Perhaps the members of session become satisfied that they have been wrong, or they find themselves able conscientiously to yield to the judgment of the superior court. They do so, and the case ends. But if, knowing the man more intimately, as they do, than the presbytery possibly could, they cannot conscientiously dispense sealing ordinances to him, or impose his unwelcome fellowship on the communicants of the congregation, they will refuse. Here is a conflict of jurisdictions. The two courts are each responsible directly to Christ: yet one of them, having more collective wisdom, as well as wider authority, has greater facilities on both accounts for judging of the bearings of the case on all interests. What is to be done? It seems to us that in such a case the presbytery cannot come between God and the congregation by commanding it to carry out the judgment. Yet the presbytery's judgment may be the right one; and is the man to be without redress? No; the presbytery's judgment will be his formal warrant to apply to some neighbouring minister and session for the privileges which have been denied by his own, and the formal warrant for that minister and session to receive his application, and, if satisfied, to grant it. This is exactly the kind of redress which has been often obtained against the injustice of particular Independent Churches, and sometimes *sub rosa* of Presbyterian kirk-sessions, to the prevention, doubtless, of hardship in individual cases, but at the same time most irregularly and to the confusion of all discipline. In the days of Scottish Moderatism, such quiet appeals to neighbouring ministers were in many cases the practical remedy for Christian men against the tyranny of intruded hirelings. And we know that in the Highlands it more than once saved the Scottish Church from serious secessions. But it was evidently a mere make-shift. It is not the regular nor the right way. The principle we are illustrating might in those cases have effected the remedy more regularly, and also have prevented some sad cases of oppression which did take place.

2. A church session admits a man to communion; but some being scandalized by the act, appeal to the presbytery, and the judgment is reversed. If the character of the man be so manifestly and grossly scandalous (as in the case of the incestuous man at Corinth), that communion with him must be participation in his sin, the presbytery will hold the session and congregation to be themselves liable to censure if they persist in their purpose of receiving him. But if the case be such that the session's persistence may be interpreted into an error of conscientious judgment, the presbytery's disapproval and reversal may not indeed have power within that congregation for the present to the effect of preventing them from receiving the man into communion; but it will within the bounds of the presbytery and elsewhere, to the effect of declaratively vindicating Christ's law, and of formally warranting all ministers, sessions, and Christian people to refuse to have even occasional communion with him until he come to repentance.

3. A presbytery refuses to ordain, or it deposes, a minister whom it has tried and judged to be unworthy. The superior court reverses the judgment; but the presbytery retain their conviction of his unworthiness, and shrink from receiving him to sit in presbytery with them. The question arises,—Has the higher court authority to enjoin the presbytery to receive him? The presumption is that the higher court is right; yet the proper effect of the judgment of reversal will in such circumstances be to authorise some other presbytery to receive him. If this took place, it would indeed be an awkward arrangement, but not comparable to the offence against conscience which it would avert; and such occasional deviations from rigid regularity are almost needful safeguards of freedom.

The reader who has followed us thus far can easily imagine other illustrative cases, and will understand our position, that the foregoing principle would remove one of the main objections raised by Congregationalists against the authority of more comprehensive over more limited Churches—an authority of which they themselves often feel the want.

But the principle has another application. It reconciles variety and freedom with unity, and is thus fitted to remove occasions for those divisions on which Episcopalians found

their most effective charge against Presbyterianism; while it renders possible what Congregationalism never even dreams of —a free and spiritual Church, that shall be at once visible and catholic. It is very plain, that if the authority of provincial or national church courts over those of smaller districts is theirs *jure divino*, and not a mere human arrangement for which it is worth no man's while to plead, it ought to be carried out even to an Œcumenical Council, supreme over all. And yet every one sees that the idea of a regular system of appeals from church-sessions upwards to a world-wide council, in *all* local cases and to *all* effects, is simply absurd. We suppose no Presbyterian ever contemplates such a thing. Yet if the common view of the co-relation of church courts is correct, it is impossible logically to stop short of this consequence. We know of no escape from it except by the principle which we maintain. For according to it, an Œcumenical Council is indeed a right thing, and that council will have real world-wide authority; but its authority, instead of being the strongest, will, as the most diffused, be in one sense the weakest. It will extend only to matters of universal concern, or to those smaller matters which have universal bearings. Thus defined, it would be safe; and so the collective wisdom and grace of the whole Christian Church might, without risk to freedom, be gathered into united action, and exercise a mighty influence on the world.

Still, is it not a dream? Have we not forgotten, in weaving our subtle web of graduated communion which is to enclose the Christian world in a mantle of unity, that there are other causes of separation besides national distinctions and intervening seas,—the far more formidable ones which consist in diversities of creed, worship, and practice? These form mountain ranges of separation, all the more formidable that they are conscientious and not physical, painfully separating Christian people in the same countries and towns into rival sects that hold no ecclesiastical fellowship with each other. We have not forgotten the existence of these obstacles, but have all along had them in view as presenting a crucial test of the validity of our argument; for we know that no Church has a right to call itself Catholic which does not make it possible for all true Christians to meet within its pale. But

in the light of our general principle, we think that a real unity, organic and authoritative, is possible between Churches which are separated by all conceivable diversities of testimony, customs, and laws, if these do not involve those essentials of faith and practice which separate Christians from the unbelieving, sin-tolerating world. And it must be incumbent, if possible. The obstacles to the general recognition of the possibility lie, we think, partly in the non-recognition of the principle of the diminution of the intensity of authority with the widening of its area; and partly in the failure to observe that diversities of opinion and practice between Christians who are one in Christ, though they operate very much like local remoteness to lessen the degree and intimacy of communion, do not render communion altogether impossible. There prevails also in some quarters what we may call a prejudice, of the absolute necessity of having ecclesiastical jurisdiction defined territorially, which contributes to the difficulty. Men who have no hesitation in admitting the lawfulness of a real ecclesiastical fellowship between Churches differing in some points of opinion and practice, if they exist in different countries, do not always see the possibility in the case of Churches that so differ in the same land. They feel instinctively that for the more distant communion less uniformity is needful. But when it comes to diversities within the same country, town, or parish, organic communion is supposed to be made impossible by almost anything which breaks uniformity—by anything short of such complete agreement as would result in interfusion. A superstition, as we think:—yet one by which none of us is consistently ruled. In large cities, our congregations and church-sessions are not rigidly defined by local districts, but are allowed to form themselves on a selective principle. Their jurisdictions are over persons, and they locally overlap. This circumstance, with whatever occasional inconvenience, is not found seriously to interfere with their harmonious action under a single presbytery. Let us extend the analogy, and ask if any ground, in reason or Scripture, exists, why two or more presbyteries, gathered by the selective affinities of like conscientious convictions or common historical associations, may not similarly overlap, or even territorially coincide? Let them but recognise one another as branches of the one Church of Christ; and though they may be conscientiously unable to

form one presbytery for the ordination of pastors, they may be able to meet in a wider synod, with a constitution to embrace them all, and with jurisdiction limited accordingly; or if not, then in a still wider assembly with still less intimate jurisdiction. Such an arrangement would be simply a constitutional carrying out of the maxim which enjoins co-operation in matters of agreement, forbearance in points of difference, and in all things love.

And could such a relation be established between *all* evangelical churches, it would be to us the very realizing of the external unity of the Church of Christ. Is it impossible? We do not expect the idiosyncrasies and educational prejudices which give rise to diversities of judgment between Churches ever to cease, any more than we expect the ocean that separates America from Europe to be drained dry. But we see no reason why the Churches should wait for the one event more than for the other before establishing real organized communion. However imperfect the organization might at first be, it would prepare the way for more; and implying an acknowledgment of oneness in Christ, it would be a real answer to the plausible claims of the Papacy founded on its pretended unity.

WILLIAM TAYLOR.

---

ART. II.—*The Christian Doctrine of the Nature and Origin of Sin.*

THE biblical doctrine of sin is essentially connected with the biblical doctrine of God. The account given of the creation advances by historical sequence into the account given of the creature's fall. As a creature, man, first of all, appears in the sacred history, and as a creature he sins and falls. Throughout the entire narrative, with simple earnestness, the relation of Creator and creature is constantly maintained. The divine record of the beginning of human history quietly ignores all impatient demands for fuller explanation, refuses to inquire wherein precisely lay God's right to impose a test of obedience upon man, stays not to discuss the special relation in which God exercises His authority, whether in His supreme position as Lord, or in His official capacity as Lawgiver, or in recognition of the yet more intimate relation of Father. The narrative

recognises only the broad general fact of an actually existing relationship as already developed in the idea of creation. Thus the biblical account of the sin-fall requires no other preliminary datum than the immediately preceding record of the genesis of the world and man.

The biblical doctrine of sin is not completely or systematically developed in any individual passage, and, in the interests of scientific biblical theology, must be expounded agreeably to the prevailing ground-tone of entire scripture revelation. But for each separate aspect of this wide-branching fundamental doctrine we may discover a *locus classicus*, in strict accordance with the idea and expression of which that particular aspect of the dogma must necessarily be developed. The passage of scripture contained in the third chapter of Genesis, however, claims for itself a position of peculiar importance, as already enunciating in few pregnant words the chief outstanding doctrinal facts which go to constitute a complete doctrine of human sin. This peculiarly deep significance attaching to the account here given of the first human sin proceeds from the recognition, also very fully made, of the generic unity of humanity, whereby, with nicest accuracy of true psychological insight, is perceived the full typical relation which subsists between this first human sin and all subsequent acts of sin. It is the assertion of a universal significance in the first act of the origin of sin that lends to the scriptural account its special characteristics, and which separates it from all other attempted explanations of the origin of sin, whether these be mythical or philosophical. The story of Genesis has no more than an external relation to the legends of the Zend Avesta and other Oriental mythologies. There we find, indeed, the same external views of the beginnings of evil, and the same attendant outer circumstances,—the origin of mankind from an absolutely first human pair, the probation tree, the tree of life, and the serpent in Ahriman the deceiver,—but these are not at all interpreted by any deep pervading religiousness of spirit. Those explanations of evil which deal only with the mere external form, find undoubtedly their proper development in the fabulous myths and marvellous legendary tales which straightway fastened themselves upon those bare skeleton frameworks. For in these elaborations of human inventiveness there appears nothing repugnant to the original hard conception of mere

outwardness. But between such legendary accretions and the simple rich spiritual account of Genesis, there is an utter antagonism ; no process can ever be devised to effect the amalgamation of such incongruous elements. If, however, such mere outward coincidences between those Oriental myths and the biblical story are insufficient, apart from spiritual analogies, to identify together their several views of the origin of sin,—on the other hand, we may not be allowed, at the suggestion of modern philosophical theorists, to discard the outer circumstances of the account of Genesis in favour of what they may regard as a more exalted spiritual conception. It seems to be one of the most serious and most damaging mistakes among modern tendencies of thought, that high spirituality of view is only possible in proportion as we have learnt to dispense with external forms, special modes of representation, and exact expression. The opposition between the external and the internal is commonly spoken of as if it were thoroughly exclusive. The contrast, however, of externality and internality, is something very different from this. The external is properly regarded as the superficial when it endeavours to usurp the place of the internal. But leaders of modern thought require to be reminded that no less certainly the internal ought to be considered thoroughly formal and unreal when it seeks illegitimately to divorce the external, and by an unnatural contortion of its own functions overturns the original disposition of nature. The biblical story of man's fall does not by any means substitute a tale of mere outer circumstance for the relatively higher and more immediately interesting consideration of psychological facts ; and thereby, as we have seen, it is clearly distinguished from all mythical endeavours in the same direction. Neither does it, on the other hand, afford any excuse for treating the historical part of the narrative as in any respect less worthy of full literal acceptance than the more direct utterances of spiritual truth. Rather the history is itself viewed as eminently spiritual, and therefore we cannot bring ourselves to dispense with the external schema, being assured that by doing so we should inevitably at the same time lose all that is special and distinctive in Scripture truth. The real importance of the historic facts can only appear when we cease to regard them as mere accessories, as the mere shell, hard and sapless, which only exists for the preservation of the

rich and tender kernel. It is very evident that were such the true relation in which Scripture statement of fact and statement of truth should be represented as standing to one another, then the former could only be held as a means to the other, which, so soon as it had been attained, might be kept in possession quite independently of its biblical setting. Such is the inevitable conclusion arrived at by a materialistic view of history which must, in all circumstances, lead to unsatisfactory results; but in no case will those results appear so palpably untenable as in the treatment of Scripture history, which must be regarded as pre-eminently sacred, inasmuch as it marks the development of the most sacred spiritual realities of human life. When, therefore, we realise the deep sacredness of all history, and the peculiar sacredness that must attach to the earliest history of our race, whereby alone can our original relation to God be authoritatively determined, then will we be thoroughly prepared to expect, in that revelation which God has granted unto us, no merely figurative and symbolical representation, but a strictly literal and exact account of the precise facts which actually constituted the stages of man's early historical development. It seems, indeed, very unfortunate that now amongst the majority of theologians there is manifested so very decided an aversion to the literal reception of the narrative given in Genesis regarding the earlier and fundamentally determining experiences of mankind. The advocacy of such views might indeed have been expected from those who in other respects gave forth an uncertain sound in their general treatment of the doctrinal facts of Scripture. We are not by any means surprised to find a theologian with a decidedly pronounced rationalistic bias affirming that "the primeval tradition of the sin-fall, preserved probably through Moses, is not the recital of a definite matter of fact, but a symbol of that which happens in every man."[1] We have here at least a thorough-going repudiation of anything distinctive in the Scriptural account. The story is associated with Adam, simply as he happened to be the first man. No proper view of the generic unity of the human race, through a federal head, can find a place here, and the sin-fall may, in this unproductive sense, be viewed as "at once the beginning and the development of all human history:" otherwise the story might be as

[1] Hase, Evangelisch-Protestantische *Dogmatik*, § 79.

circumstantially related of any individual among Adam's posterity. Among such writers we find little interest taken in the historical facts of revelation, and correspondingly little hesitancy shewn in their utter disavowal. But when we come to theologians of very different tendencies,—those who cling faithfully to the truth of the written word, and who interpret its doctrines in a truly living and spiritual manner,—we cannot but express our surprise when we find amongst them a growing tendency to accept, inconsistently as it seems with their general principles, a form of expression most suspiciously similar to the result of rationalistic criticism just referred to. Thus, for example, one of the most accomplished of modern theological writers, and an earnest defender of a full and sound interpretation of Scripture, has given utterance to his views in such form at least as may be construed in this way: "In the Mosaic account of the fall (Genesis iii.) we meet with a combination of history and sacred symbolism, a figurative representation of an actual event. The fact of the fall is there represented by a consciousness to which both paradise and the fall are transcendental and pre-historic; for which reason there can be no immediate knowledge of it, but only a mediate and allegorical one, as in a glass darkly."[1] What we object to here is scarcely at all the doctrine, but the expression given to that doctrine, which not only is in itself misleading, but also indicates the undue influence which has been allowed to modes of thought and speech, for which the rationalising tendency of the age has gained general currency. From the whole tenor of Martensen's conception of human sin, as well as from what follows in that very paragraph from which we have quoted, it is evident that he can have no interest in weakening the force and precision of the biblical doctrine of the fall; and so we even find him firmly maintaining that had this historical account of the fall not been recorded in revelation, it must then have been postulated as a necessary truth. Nevertheless, to describe the account given of the historical fact as a combination of history and sacred symbolism, is surely at least confusingly to blend together two distinct, and as thus expressed, incongruous views of one and the same thing. Would not the more consistent expression be, that the record of Genesis is a true history, the exact and literal details of which,—inasmuch as it is a most pregnant

[1] Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, § 79.

spiritual history—must be interpreted according to the general principles of Scripture symbolism? There is here no mere combination of history and symbol, but a literal history yielding the materials of spiritual symbolism. Certainly when we have clearly understood the true importance and full spiritual significance of history, we shall be quite prepared, with the utmost decision, to maintain that if there be any statement in the Mosaic account of the fall which must be treated as not literally historical, that never can by us be accepted as having any symbolic value. If we are to treat of the mystical significance of the trees and of the serpent, we must first admit that the fall of man was the result of a veritable seduction of the serpent by means of a distinct and actual probation tree. The symbolical view, apart from the literal story, is quite untenable; but the sacred story, accepted in its complete literalness, affords a most sufficient basis for symbolic interpretation.

It has appeared necessary to speak thus fully regarding what we consider the proper interpretation of this passage of Scripture, inasmuch as we find here already contained all the main positions upon which the biblical doctrine of sin must be reared. But upon this basis of an accepted full literalness of interpretation we may now proceed to analyse the contents of this primeval record, in so far as it refers to the origin and nature of sin, leaving out of account for the present what it says of sin's consequences.

The exposition of a doctrine which depends upon a purely biblical grounding must begin with the question of origin rather than with that of essence or distinctive nature. We must inquire whence sin arose, and have an understanding of the conditions of its possibility and actuality, before we can be prepared to enter upon any satisfactory examination of its meaning and contents. The question regarding the origin of evil, in so far as it refers simply to human history, is very fully and satisfactorily answered in the scriptural account of the fall. The metaphysical problem, however, which refers us back to scenes enacted in other spheres, is essentially beyond our solution. The philosophical inquiry, and not that presented by Scripture, must be regarded as fundamentally pre-historic and transcendental. We might safely have made this statement even before venturing upon any attempt to answer or explain. For in such matters, admittedly

transcendental, revelation clearly could be our only guide. Revelation, however, does not furnish us with the history of the angels' fall, much less with the circumstances which led to it. And it is just in these antecedent circumstances that this grand mystery lies. The doctrine of superhuman evil and of a sin-fall anterior to man's creation, does not solve the mystery of God's permission of evil, but it renders us reason sufficient for our ignorance, as it clearly indicates that the source lies concealed amongst the hidden things of God. The true doctrine as to the nature and precise extent of the influence which the dogmatic results of a scriptural view of the origin of sin in the spirit-world must exercise upon the doctrine of the origin of human sin, has been well explained by Oosterzee:[1] "The origin of sin in man is better understood, if we may assume that a spirit has worked here which excelled man in cunning and craft. If the question, how this spirit himself could fall so low as to rebel against God, must remain unanswered, the same difficulty applies also to the existence of sin in man. Enough that sin has a history older than that of this present world, and that no philosophy can construct this history *a priori*, nor deny it *a posteriori*." The author of evil—its ultimate principle, so far as the history of man is concerned—keeps himself concealed, and continues through all time an invisible worker, known only and remembered by the evil he has done. And thus for the products of his activity is he recognised as a veritable power, possessed of a thoroughly distinctive personality, and embodying most determinate attributes. The practical solution of the question is undoubtedly conditioned by human experience, but this experience again demands as its basis a transcendent origin. To say, however, that evil here has a transcendent origin, is something very different from saying that its existence is eternal. There is eternal good, but not eternal evil. Nevertheless, so soon as the possibility of created good was realised, there appeared as its dark background a contemporary possibility of evil. This special manifestation of the temporal possibility was grounded in a previous possibility which had been already realised before the present time began. It was this actual evil existing as a mighty principle outside of the new world, and unrelated to humanity, which, now entering

[1] Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, § lxxvi. 10.

the domain of man, was permitted to call forth the exercise of human freedom. And this active principle of temptation, as the full and free presentation of an alternative, was the necessary presupposition of man's moral development. Evil then lay as an undeveloped, and so far negative, principle which now first gained for itself an adequate sphere when it entered the kingdom of free rational personality.

The long, and in some respects very suggestive, discussion of the relation of the evil principle to a personal evil power, so ingeniously wrought out by Martensen, seems in its ultimate consequences unproductive,—a needless speculative refinement which cannot properly demand a place in a scientific theological review. We can find no interest or sufficient purpose in the refusal immediately to recognise Satan in the serpent, although indeed the narrative of Genesis waits not to make that explanation. Such an explanation we could not at this stage expect, nor could we deem its appearance here at all appropriate. But in reading now the story, we maintain not only the right, but also the necessity, of understanding it in the full light which has in the fulness of times been shed upon it.[1] The words of Lutz seem more in accordance with a correct view of our passage: "The serpent is worthy of attention, which belongs to the outer given material, and does not appear as a mere allegorical representation; but the thought is this,—man has a disposition and susceptibility to evil, the impulse, however, comes from a power outside of him, with which, according to his disposition, he agrees: evil is a might and unity which gains ascendancy."[2] The biblical doctrine of the sin-fall thus at once leads us beyond the bounds of our present condition. Human sin is viewed as at once a cause and an effect,—the earliest sinful thought and tendency in man is at once self-originated and outwardly determined. The personal tempter can appeal to a sympathetic tendency of thought and feeling,—a tendency incapable of development, unless it were brought under the influence of a determining principle, but which yet demanded the application of such a test in order that the nature in which it appeared should have its perfection established and matured. The mystery of the sin-fall is therefore really superhuman, and the essential

[1] Compare especially John viii. 44; 2 Cor. xi. 3, 14.

[2] Lutz, Biblische Dogmatik, p. 113.

principles of evil are thus seen to be ante-temporal in origin and in development.

The pure contents, therefore, of the historical account in Genesis requires us to assume the apostacy in the angel world as affording the ultimate ground for any truly biblical theory regarding the origin of evil. And yet in the very fact thus forced upon us do we read, beyond the express utterances of Scripture, many of the characteristics of that mighty race. In reference to the human sin-fall, we require to postulate the existence and reality of a personal tempter who presents the alternative to man; but this, on the other hand, is not demanded in the case of the angels. Their fall sprang from elements entirely self-contained. We may, indeed, affirm that they fell through temptation; but this was presented through no outward power. The dualism here was an inner development. The tempter and the tempted were one. Nor is this peculiarity without a satisfactory explanation. In our conception of the angelic nature, we properly regard this as an essential attribute, that dominion within their allotted sphere was exercised directly,—that the angel is the immediately efficient agency in producing and in regulating within that kingdom. Their individual personality lay only in realised consciousness of being the active centre of that sphere. In this lies the ground of that distinction, so well stated by Martensen, between impersonal powers of nature and personal angelic existences. Angels, properly so called, must be regarded as self-conscious beings, on whose consciousness of the sphere in which they are operative hangs the proof of their personality. Yet at the same time we are obliged to regard these personal beings as much more intimately related to their several spheres than personal human beings can ever be. The angel being and the angel world are thus considered as inwrought together. The angels were in their world by an immediate spiritual influence. Hence their sphere and kingdom may be defined: the world in which they lived—the world which was in them. In this dominion arose the first possibility of sin,—in a very significant manner, if we may employ the phrase with this special application, "a cosmical principle." The contrast of the kingdoms of that world with the kingdom of God constituted the seducing principle. And here, it would seem, do we find the true point of contact

between the idea of the fall in the spirit-world and the idea of a fall in the human sphere. The element which proved potent in either case was the seductive influence of the contrast unrighteously exaggerated between their special creaturely dominion and that which should ever have been regarded as all-embracing—the universal kingdom of God.

But just here, too, does the true distinction between the sin-fall in the one case and in the other most fully appear. In the case of man, there was needed the mediation of an active personal tempter. In the case of the angels, as we have sought to explain, the direct relationship subsisting between them and their kingdoms would not allow, as it did not require, the intervention of any such mediation. The contrast of the impersonal world, as a rivalry of kingdoms, took immediately a personal form in the envy which arose in the breasts of those self-conscious beings who could articulate the unconscious mutterings of nature. And hence the result of Christian speculation and the teaching of ecclesiastical tradition, alike imply that the Devil was his own tempter. Through envy of God's majesty and power he fell; and this envy was immediately aroused by that direct presentation which he himself made of the glories of his domain to his own spirit. We have here, then, the spontaneous origin of actual evil. The evil principle thus first gains actuality before the dawn of human history when it clothed itself in personality. This principle had a still earlier origin as a possibility. A mere possibility, however, is itself no creation; it is simply the negation of creation. It exists indeed but only as the undefined and contingent complement of the actual. The evil principle thus, as a possibility, is not moral evil. It becomes such only when it dislodges the actual, and takes its place and name.

The sacred record has, therefore, given immediate prominence to the fact of an historical temptation, thereby silently attesting the existence in man of a complete moral nature. It is now admitted on all sides that temptation in some form is a necessary moment in the moral and religious development of the creature; for without freedom no religious life is possible. Religion can only be developed on the basis of morality, and where no possibility for the appearance of contradictories exists, there, certainly, no moral development

can ever take its rise. Morality is entirely based upon freedom, which must consist in the actual presentation of an alternative; the possibility of attaining unto moral good through conscious preference of the good, and the possibility of falling into moral evil by the guilty conscious choice of the evil. But in order that this possibility may have something more than a mere docetic existence, and in order that the consequent morality may be more than seeming, the advantages that are contained in the good, and the apparent advantages contained in the evil, must be unfolded and brought into full view before him who is required to make his deliberate choice. Man's temptation most truly consists in having the presentation made to him of that which is evil arrayed in its most enticing and alluring forms. Yet actual sin in man does not appear until his heart acknowledges that the attraction presented has made a lasting and influential impression upon it. For we must ever remember that "the mere thinking of evil does not in itself constitute a temptation, and that in order to its being a temptation, the evil must appear adapted to, and must be enticing to, the self-love of our sensuous nature; for to the nature of man enjoyment is always dearer than privation, honour than disgrace, and a throne than a cross. Not that we are to conceive the enjoyments of life, honour, and rule to be essentially sinful. They are that only under certain conditions. Nor do we necessarily contract defilement through our sense of the pleasantness of these things. Only when it has a corrupting effect on the moral feelings, disturbs the judgment, and gives an ungodly bias to the will and activity, can this be affirmed."[1] An actual temptation, therefore, embracing all these several elements, must be regarded as an essential moment in the spiritual development of man. "The first pair were created, as we have reason to suppose, adults in stature and intellect, but infants in spiritual growth and experience" (*Heard*). It was required, then, that the innocence of the child should develop into the virtue of the man. Müller has most happily marked the grand transition from the one state to the other here attained, by the contrast of the οὐ γνῶναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν of Romans vii. 7, with the μὴ γνῶναι ἁμαρτίαν of 2 Cor. v. 21,—the

[1] Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*, p. 138. Compare also generally pages 127-129.

one indicating the innocence of childhood, where no actual presentation of the alternative had been made, the other indicating the attainment of moral goodness, through the full conscious rejection of the evil and appropriation of the good.

In proclaiming thus the doctrine of the necessity of temptation, we must carefully defend its statement from all abuse. Nor can we better do so than by giving an explicit disapproval of that tendency, which, in one or other of its varied forms, has become general in these times, to proclaim the practical necessity of evil. We cannot, indeed, here deny that, to a certain extent, this view is a reaction against the more loose and unguarded expressions employed by some advocates of liberty, who sought to dispense entirely with necessity in speech and fact. The extravagant demands of libertarians gave occasion to many bitter retorts from opponents, who denounced the system that seemed so readily to develop into licentiousness. We feel ourselves thus compelled, while maintaining, in view of man's freedom, the necessity of temptation and the consequent possibility of sin, to maintain with equal determinateness a corresponding possibility of sinlessness. In this way alone can we avoid the errors, on the one hand, of Optimism, which exaggerates the admitted possibility of sin into a practical necessity, and, on the other hand, of avowed Manichæism, which insists upon discovering in the non-moral sphere of nature that which is essentially immoral as the inevitable germ of sin. We can thus understand how it is just as absurd to deny necessity as it is to deny freedom. But when we inquire more narrowly, we find that the only real necessity is the necessity for freedom. Man can be man only by being a moral agent. The attribute of morality constitutes the true *differentia* of humanity. The possibility, then, of evil in the spiritual development of man, is the ultimate necessity upon which is grounded the reality of his free rationality. Nevertheless, this necessity for the possibility of evil must be regarded as contradictory to, and incompatible with, the notion of the necessity of its actual realisation. We certainly could not more decidedly express our repudiation of the doctrine of the necessity of evil, than by enunciating instead a doctrine of the necessity for such a possibility of evil. As Müller has very tersely and accurately expressed it, "A possibility which must realise itself, is not a

possibility, but a necessity." For although this possibility was necessary, it yet was such as never should have developed into anything beyond the mere possibility. There was here no necessary development from potentiality to actuality. "Evil," says Martensen, "is just that possibility which ought to have remained a possibility for ever."

Thus far, then, in dealing with the Mosaic narrative as the *locus classicus* for the biblical doctrine of the origin of sin in mankind, we have endeavoured to vindicate the literal interpretation of the history, and upon this intelligible ground to maintain the full personality of the tempter, and the reality of his temptation. A very important question in reference to the doctrine of the origin of sin in humanity still remains, demanding most careful investigation; the question, namely, Whether this be in reality a doctrine revealed in Scripture, and, particularly, whether it is chiefly taught in the passage now before us? From the actual contents of the narrative of Genesis are we obliged to regard the sin-fall there described as indicating the positively earliest beginning of human sin, —as the first realisation, that is, of sin in which mankind was at all interested? Müller has very decidedly stated his opinion that nothing in this narrative obliges us to consider the fall as the primary beginning of sin in the strict sense of the word; that neither the image of God, nor the divine approval of everything as very good, sets aside the belief that "the fall was only the outward manifestation of a perversion of the will preceding the empirical life of man." Such a statement is, of course, simply preparatory. It is argued that Scripture does not repudiate the doctrine, and so, if occasion should require, it may be resorted to. That such occasion does arise, Müller considers that he has proved, in the necessity for reconciling the doctrine of hereditary or inborn sinfulness with individual guilt. At present we have to do only with the preparatory statement, in which vindication is sought apologetically for so daring an assumption. Inasmuch as we are at present mainly interested in the interpretation of the Mosaic narrative of the fall, we must endeavour to ascertain the precise value of the theory here proposed, which, according to its acceptance or rejection, cannot fail most radically to affect that interpretation. Müller seems, on his part, to have been compelled to resort to this immense, and, as we hold,

altogether unwarrantable assumption, on account of a series of difficulties into which he had been driven, not by the problem, so much as by his own statement of it, and by the general insufficiency of his appreciation of that Scripture foundation upon which alone any adequate theory can be grounded.

(1.) First, he has given forth a most uncertain sound in reference to the interpretation of the Mosaic account. Acknowledging that the apostle Paul recognises it in his own religious consciousness as an historical fact, Müller refuses to recognise in it anything more than an historical germ, and repudiates in name of theology the task of maintaining its historical character in every particular. Further, his views of the verisimilitude of Scripture is most unsatisfactory, since he considers that the oral tradition had gradually assumed a drapery inadequate to the full representation of those primary relations. He fitly concludes such a statement of loose and uncertain doctrine by the embarrassing statement, that "the narrative does not necessarily imply the transference of the first man from a state of perfect purity and freedom from any sinful disposition or bias into a state of dominant sinfulness, but it does certainly most clearly teach that the depravity of man, however it may have originated, has its foundation in himself." Thus we see that Müller, starting with so unworthy a canon of interpretation, has been by logical consistency obliged to admit that in the attenuated remnant of positive statement in Scripture thus interpreted, no satisfactory or sufficient trace can be found of the real primary origin of sin in mankind. Elsewhere he confesses that it is difficult to discriminate between the symbolic colouring of the narrative and the historical fact. The apostle found no difficulty here, for he treated the whole narrative as historical fact; and it is little wonder though the most subtle among modern theorists should find it difficult to discriminate where no difference exists. We have already sought to shew that such a doctrine could only arise out of a mistaken view of the meaning of symbolism. The symbol may be rich in spiritual application, and yet be strictly and in literal fact historically true. We have no cause to doubt the historical truth of each separate event in this record of the sin-fall, nor for this reason to detract from its symbolic importance. Now, Müller has not even attempted to shew any reason for doubting the historic

validity of details, nor has he explained why we ought not as well to suspect the accuracy of all other points in the narrative. He has certainly altogether neglected to shew by what criterion we may discriminate between the important or historical, and the detailed or symbolical parts of the narrative.

(2.) Second. In consequence of this view of the meaning of the original passage of Genesis, Müller regards the inquiry into the first origin of sin as a problem of speculative and not of biblical theology. We have here, then, two very important questions to answer; on the one hand, as to the validity of the distinction maintained, and on the other, as to the reference of this special subject to the speculative sphere.

(*a.*) We inquire then, first of all, What precisely is implied in making such a distinction in theology between the sphere of the speculative and the biblical? According to Müller, there exist within the range of theology two distinct and separate departments; the religious teaching of the apostles, and the development of the speculative element. The latter is not supposed to be provided for in the utterance of apostolic doctrine; no attempt is made to shew that revelation sanctions the recognition of such an appendage; yet this speculative element must not contradict Scripture, but rather must appear implied in Scripture doctrine (*Müller*, ii. 393). Now, here we find ourselves again in presence of an unsatisfactory and uncertain theory. The author is ready to admit that his notion of an extra-temporal sin-fall is no Scripture doctrine, but a speculative theory; and yet he wishes it to be regarded as a *theologoumenon*, already implicated in the doctrine of Scripture, and evolved out of this by speculative methods. We have then, here, in the very discovery of this implication, the employment of a speculative process; for the result arrived at is the development of a doctrine of which it had previously been said—"The testimony of Scripture fails us concerning the extra-temporal self-deciding of created personalities." And consequently the question here arises, whether the speculative knowledge which "holy Scripture was not intended to give," has any claim to be styled theological. Where Scripture fails us, does not theology in any proper sense come to an end? Certainly in all the great leading sections of Christian theology, questions will be suggested which Scripture

proposes not to answer. The theologian, however, is properly obliged to leave them just as Scripture has done, but the Christian philosopher may frame such theories as he regards accordant with the spirit of revealed truth. Only in this way can theology be relieved of a responsibility that rightly belongs not to the science, and speculations no longer viewed as *theologoumena* must stand or fall by their own merits. Whatever is non-biblical is non-theological, and we repudiate the distinction of departments in theology as speculative and biblical.

(*b.*) Our next inquiry must be, Whether the question of the origin of sin in mankind may properly be regarded as belonging to the speculative sphere? According to our conception of theology, to relegate this problem to speculative treatment is quite equivalent to refusing it a place in the theological system. The question, therefore, resolves itself into this—Can we vindicate for the inquiry regarding the initial and primary origin of human sin an undoubted place in the theological treatment of the Christian doctrine of sin? We find our answer to this question in the results of a careful examination of the original passage of Genesis, according to the principles already laid down. In the words of this record we certainly find no repudiation of the intention to yield a narrative of the true origin of human sin; and were such not the purpose of that history, we should expect a more definite statement of the peculiar problem. Following immediately as it does the history of man's creation, we should naturally be prepared to find in it a simple historical continuation, nor should we be justified in interpreting this latter section on any other principles than those applied to the former. Now, in the creation history, we have no hint given of a doctrine of pre-existence; rather the plain and manifest declaration of fact is, not that God refashioned and used up old materials when He originated man's temporal existence, but that from the new made earth He formed the body of His creature, and by a fresh breath of His nostrils caused man to become a living soul. But if there be no place left in the account of the creation for the consistent introduction of a theory of pre-existence, then, certainly, in the account of the fall which follows, and, which, in the absence of any hint as to sudden change of ground, we must regard as proceeding immediately

upon the basis which the preceding narrative afforded, cannot assume for its own support any such theory, the untenableness of which has been proved by this admitted previous inconsistency. We are, indeed, left in no doubt as to the intention of the history of man's creation given in Genesis, if only we are prepared to accept its full literal interpretation. When we apply the same method in our examination of the account given of the fall, the same satisfactory results must follow. The Mosaic story of creation expressly professes to account not merely for the first appearance of man, not merely for the beginning of his temporal being, but for the very earliest essential moments of human existence. The Mosaic story of the fall continues the history of that creature whose beginning has been there related, and consequently the perversion in the will of the creature of which this later history tells, must be regarded on biblical grounds as a temporal development, inasmuch as it refers to a creature whose being has begun in time. The intimacy of internal connection between these two narratives, therefore, compels us to claim for the record of Genesis concerning the fall the intention of yielding an explanation of the earliest origin of human sin. It is at least very manifest that such a conclusion, and the literal interpretation of the biblical record, must stand and fall together.

We have now completed what we proposed to do in the way of criticising Müller's theory of an extra-temporal sin-fall. In this inquiry we have restricted ourselves to the one main issue on the question of Scripture interpretation. Even were this point passed over, we are well aware that sundry weighty objections must be made against the doctrine when put forth as an explanation of inborn sinfulness; but these, as introducing the consequences of the sin-fall, we have for the present carefully avoided. Our present discussion has had direct reference to the Scripture doctrine of the origin of human sin, which we have endeavoured to shew could not, apart from the principles now urged, maintain for itself any satisfactory position.

In passing now from the consideration of the origin of sin to a statement of the biblical doctrine regarding the nature of sin, we find the most natural point of transition in the relation of sin to the revelation of law. Manifestly the ques-



to induce the creature to disobey. Tempta
dience plainly pre-supposes the deliverance of
the relations between the Creator and the cre
manifested, was the relation of Law-giver a
Had God given no law, there could have been
Had there been no temptation, there could h
Hence there would have been no sin, had
law given. This marks the relation of law t
therefore, in regard to sin in its ultimate sen
*sine qua non*. But when we consider that, a
a revelation of law, which is simply the expli
the divine will, holiness, in the strict and pro
be quite as impossible of attainment as an actu
be, we will understand how erroneous woul
that the expression of the will of God in legisla
the presence of any unsatisfactory element
The will of the Creator in relation to the
necessity assume the form of law, and law as
only the language of command. We are the
agree with the view of Ullmann, when he rega
of this form as an indication of a false separa
made between the ideas of law and duty.
commands—when it is obliged to take the
shalt!'—this argues an unsatisfactory moral
where the moral condition is what it should

addressed to violate the requirements of that law. We cannot, certainly, refuse to acknowledge in this matter a definite development, but we should find this only by reversing the order of stages indicated by Ullmann. Our progression must be from the outward enforcement of the precepts of the law toward the full internal self-appropriation of the same. The command must first be addressed to the free moral agent, in order that he may with free moral significance choose it for himself as "the indwelling principle of action." No reason has yet been discovered that could justify our rejection of the orderly arrangement of the Mosaic narrative, according to which God as Creator makes known to the creature, as yet altogether free from evil propensity, His will in outward legislative form. The Creator claimed the right of saying to the creature, "Thou shalt not eat of the tree in the midst of the garden." And therefore at this point do we find the problems of the origin and of the nature of sin in immediate contact. For, while the delivery of the law has rendered possible the declaration of opposition, it has also intimated that in this opposition the essence of sin consists.

The distinctive grandeur of the biblical doctrine of sin rests in the clearness and completeness of its conception. Already in this account of the first human sin, we have fully indicated the fruitful germs of every possible form of its subsequent development. The fundamental position of God's Word in reference to sin is, that it must always be regarded as disobedience against God. From this ultimate definition the entire biblical doctrine is developed, no single element not already contained in this conception being afterward introduced. It only remains for us to mark the several stages in this notional and real development.

(1.) First of all, let us clearly indicate the scope and contents of this biblical view of sin, according to which it is regarded as consisting essentially in disobedience against God. The grand secret of the immeasurable superiority of biblical morals over the purest and most earnest developments of human systems is found in the unwavering assurance with which it claims for its ultimate grounding the fact of immediate relationship between the Creator and the creature. The only primal relation of the creature was that whereby he was connected with his Creator; any other relations could only



it utterly impossible to work out a doctrine at
and in accordance with human experience. This
all dualistic explanations of sin, from its grossest
in Oriental Manichæism to the latest theories of
cultured Optimism. The expectation of discoveri
of sin in man's relation to nature, is simply put
which should be last, mistaking a later develo
original form. Man could not possibly relate
false manner to nature unless he had first of all
primary normal relation to God. Equally unsat
every theory prove that would define the ess
of sin by way of privation, according to the
limitation of his individual nature. The crea
relation to the creature, whether regarded a
tinguished as a non-ego, only according as
originally subsisting between the creature an
had been recognised. If this primal relatio
confused, then, but not till then, can the i
relations become deranged. Now this pri
originates in the simple expression of the Creat
expression of the supreme will cannot take th
suasion or entreaty, but must necessarily assum
authoritative command. And thus, by being
associated with the pure conception of God, we
secured for the biblical doctrine of sin an ic

reference to man's ultimate relation, and so, upon every manifestation of sin, require from man this confession before God: "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight." We find this doctrine of sin as a direct offence against God already explicitly recognised in the early history of patriarchal times, when Jehovah, in addressing the pious king of Gerar, says, not that He had prevented him sinning against Abraham or against Sarah (though that also was true secondarily), but indicating the ultimate reference of sin,—"I also withheld thee from sinning against Me" (Gen. xx. 6). And again, various examples under the institution of the Mosaic law will occur to every one, in which offences committed by one man, apparently against his fellowmen, are immediately regarded by God as trespasses committed against Himself (Lev. vi. 2; Num. v. 6, &c.). "To do evil in the presence of a revealed God is to sin against God; and this also, not merely as the form of the consciousness developing itself under the law, but in consequence of express declaration, 'Whosoever hath sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book' (Exod. xxxii. 33)—a repetition of that which was spoken to our first parents, and suspended over them. Hence also the confession, We have sinned against Thee" (Harless, *Chr. Eth.*, p. 112). But the only evil that is possible in the presence of a revealed God, is disobedience to His revealed will. Whatever form this revelation of will may take, it must ever be recognised as essentially a revelation of law. And as we have seen that the sinfulness of all manner of sins consists in their being committed against God, we therefore must, on biblical grounds, state the essential definition of sin as transgression of God's law or disobedience to His will.

(2.) Further, in the development of the principles of truth contained in this definition, we must inquire how the expression of the divine will is related to the determination of moral qualities in purposes and actions. If we revert to the Mosaic narrative of the sin-fall, we cannot fail to perceive that the trial through which the creature was required to pass had for its outer or material determining fact a consideration in itself most evidently non-moral, which, however, afford an opportunity for the commencement of a moral development, inasmuch as it brought man into immediate and decisive contact with the expression of the divine will. In this view

of the tree of knowledge, as being of moral significance only when considered as a test of obedience, we have a general consensus of the more sober and sagacious theologians of ancient and modern times.[1] The morally indifferent act becomes at once decisively moral whenever it gives expression to God's will. Thus we have the distinction of good and evil, at least for us, determined by the arbitrary will of God. Let us, however, remember that this arbitrariness is nothing more than the unconditionateness of the divine will which belongs to our pure conception of God; while human arbitrariness is simply man's refusal to acknowledge that conditionateness which as surely belongs to the pure conception of the creature. "Thus, while with God a thing is right because He wills it, with all His creatures the converse is to be the rule; we are to will it, because it is right" (*Heard*). By this doctrine at least we must firmly hold, that the will of God is the point of attraction and repulsion,—that in purpose and action moral character is determined only in relation to the eternally holy will of God, and that our only notion of rightness means conformity to that will as revealed in law.

(3.) The doctrine of the nature of sin which considers it to consist essentially and ultimately in disobedience against God, brings out into very clear prominence the inwardness of character. A controversy has been long maintained in reference to the intended range and scope of positive law. Schleiermacher and many others have contended that law affects only the external act, and does not necessarily refer at all to the inner motive. Now, if we take a sufficiently deep view of the nature of law, we cannot fail to see the untenableness of such a statement. Rather, we should say, just because law immediately concerns itself with the external act, therefore, in the matter of sin, it must make reference to the inner disposition and resolve. When we refuse to complicate our definition of law, but continue regarding it simply as a manifestation of the divine will, we must understand that while, indeed, outward actions may seem conformable to it, without the reality of an internal spring, it is quite impossible that acts done in opposition to its command should be regarded simply in an external way, apart from that inner divergence which has prompted

[1] Compare: Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, lxx. 8; Auberlen, *Divine Revelation*, p. 183; Heard, *Tripartite Nature of Man*, pp. 170–173.

the overt act, and thus rendered disobedience against God an actual experience. We have understood the revelation of law as in every way equivalent to the manifestation of God's will. So soon as this will has gained expression, the obligation of the creature to obey it has appeared. But here we must remember that will can only address will. The divine will does not address the physical powers of the creature, nor even directly his understanding; the command which expresses the divine volition can only be received and acted upon by the human will. And so we distinguish not between transgressions of the law of God and disobedience against His will, except in so far as they view the same fact from different points. The disobedient spirit can find expression only in transgression, but neither disobedience in heart nor transgression in life would be possible apart from the expression of the divine will in the revelation of positive law.

(4.) But further we remark, that sin as disobedience attains its end through the misemployment of God-given powers. According to the doctrine of Scripture, sin is not regarded as any new element imported into God's good universe. It is not by any means a new creation. The prince of this world gains dominion for himself, but is not at all endowed with creative power. Sin, therefore, in human nature is no new nature. It is as a principle regulative rather than productive. The elements which the tempter had to deal with when he sought to originate a sinful development were purely normal, perfectly human, nothing less and nothing more. Now these elements, as constituting one complete being, are nearly allied, while, as viewed in their separate characteristics and tendencies, they are radically distinct. Hence quite naturally the discussion in reference to the essence of human sin has appropriated as distinguishing watchwords of opposing parties the decisive contrasts of the sensual and the spiritual. Because sin, as it characteristically appears in selfishness, finds its readiest manifestation in the sensible, we are induced to rank the sphere of sense as essentially low, the fitting scene of sin's commencement. The sphere of manifestation, however, may not be the sphere of origination. In itself the sensible forms any lodgment for evil, just as little as the higher nature. Each side of human nature was a pure creation of God. The combination of the two in definite relations was a divine

accomplishment. In the most strict sense there can be no human act that is purely spiritual, for every human act must reflect the mutual influences of the two elements whereby it is constituted. The elements are distinguished as spiritual and sensible only according to the predominance in each several case of spirit or of sense. In man's relations to God the human side comprised the complete being. In spiritual and sensible acts man was required to maintain this relation. Failure in one or the other would have been sin, inasmuch as it would have affected this relation. Man's sin indeed arose on the spiritual side, which, however, was not itself wholly spiritual. The immediate content of the temptation was sensual: the ultimate content was spiritual. The fruit was fair and sweet; by the knowledge of good and evil to which they should attain, they believed that they should become as Gods. Yet, although the eating of the fruit appears a merely sensual act, it can have dogmatic significance only when considered in its ethical reference. The potency of the temptation by no means lay in any seductive influence which the sensible properties of the fruit possessed, but in the spiritual end attainable (as it appeared) only through the sensible partaking thereof. It must at the same time be remembered that it had already been carefully noted that the sensible means for the attainment of such a spiritual end were in themselves agreeable. The sensual was thus auxiliary to the spiritual: for in reaching the spiritual, not only would the senses suffer no unpleasantness, but would be themselves yet more fully gratified. We can, therefore, find no encouragement in the account of the sin-fall given in Genesis for the attempts which have been made by so many dogmatists to trace the earliest origin of human sin exclusively to one or other of those elements constituting humanity, and thus to discover the ultimate nature and fullest essence of human sin in a development of the sensibility, or in a development of the spiritual element, in man. The true breadth and fulness of the biblical view includes all the principles insisted upon by modern theological science, while refusing to rest in any one as ultimate. The "cosmical principle" of Martensen is an expression too vague and indeterminate to indicate satisfactorily a potency so distinctly active in determining such mighty issues. Inasmuch, however, as it rises above the one-sided conception which places the germ of sin in one or other of the

two great elements of human nature, it marks a decided advance, and yields for us at least this truth, that we must not expect to find the pure principle of evil in any mere false relation or undue proportioning of those separate parts of the human unity. We can no longer acquiesce in the reduction of human sin in essence to selfishness, which has now become the generally accepted doctrine (Müller, Ullmann, Nitzsch, Oosterzee, Hase). Nor, on the other hand, can we claim any more favourable consideration for the view that ultimately resolves sin into sensualism, which, though not now so generally received, has recently had some very distinguished advocates (Schleiermacher, Rothe, Ritter). The common error in these conflicting theories whereby they are thoroughly vitiated consists in this, that they deal with subordinate relations, not with the original and primary relation whereby the creature is brought into immediate contact with the Creator. It is indeed argued on behalf of the theory of selfishness, that it takes immediate cognisance of alienation from God as the real spring of sin. But why should we then pass away from the ultimate fact, as if we could find a yet stricter definition in the consideration of that subsequent operation whereby we supply the place of a lost God by the illegitimate elevation of the creature or self. The fact of alienation from God is comprehensive of all manner of sin. This is precisely the character which any adequate theory of sin must have, and which the conflicting theories of selfishness and sensualism do not possess. The grounds for repudiating both theories have been very fully and satisfactorily expounded by Dr Hodge: "It is contrary to the testimony of every man's consciousness to say that selfishness is the essential element of sin. There is no selfishness in malice nor in emnity to God. There are far higher forms of evil than mere selfishness. The true nature of sin is alienation from God, and opposition to His character and will. It is the opposite of holiness, and does not admit of being reduced to any one principle, either the love of the creature or the love of self." "The works of the flesh are not merely sensual works, but sinful works, everything in man that is evil. . . . The scriptures, therefore, are directly opposed to the theory which makes the body or the sensuous nature of man the source of sin, and its essence to consist in yielding to our appetites and worldly affections, instead of obeying the reason and con-

science."[1] Those offered explanations of sin, therefore, we consider not really contradictory; they are naturally embraced under a higher unity, and thus comprehended offer a thoroughly sufficient definition of sin as disobedience against the revealed will of God. If once severed, and regarded as separate principles, they never can be brought together again. But if from the first we seek to develop them together, the issue will be a doctrine of the nature of sin thoroughly biblical in method and results.

We must, however, very carefully guard against the notion that the purpose of man's probation was merely to fix in man any natural order determined by God, and already present in the creature. We must much rather view the trial as marking the active beginning of a moral development. "The discipline man was put under in Eden was not merely to choose the good and refuse the evil, to make reason the sovereign and appetite the servant; it was also to know good and evil,—to know that the essence of goodness consisted in obedience to God's rule as such, and that the rule of sin is disobedience and self-will."[2] This is a truth which cannot be too earnestly insisted on. It is just the old doctrine, often stated yet often forgotten, that all moral development must begin in consciousness, and that God brings forth the expression of His will in legislative form, just in order that man, by means of a moral development, possible only through the working of his conscience, may himself resolve to obey or disobey.

We have now completed our investigation of the two problems which we proposed to ourselves as to the origin and the nature of human sin. It only remains for us to vindicate for this paper the title which we have chosen for it,—The Christian Doctrine of the Origin and Nature of Sin. We have dwelt almost exclusively with the narrative of Genesis regarding the entrance of sin into our world, maintaining that there we find the richest and most complete statement of principles abundantly sufficient to account for every subsequent development of sin. It can only be by the most superficial conceptions regarding the sources of Christian truth that the apparent separation of this account from the

[1] Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, ii. p. 149 and p. 145.
[2] Heard, *Tripartite Nature of Man*, pp. 171–172.

historical development of the Christian belief should be considered as depriving the doctrine thereon fundamentally established, from being received into the system of Christian doctrine. The doctrine of sin, as equivalent to the history of the disease, may be very fully traced and rendered comprehensively complete, apart altogether from the fact or revelation of redemption as the history and science of the cure. While, therefore, earnestly insisting upon the genetic unity of the divine revelation, we must regard the doctrine of sin as fundamentally expounded in its entirety in the Old Testament. Facts there revealed may be afterwards illustrated in a striking manner, and placed in a new light, but no really novel fact requires to be added to complete the doctrinal statement; whereas the doctrine of redemption is peculiarly the doctrine of the New Testament, and when regarded as strictly developed upon the basis of the Old Testament doctrine of sin, is found already in a form perfect, and admitting neither addition nor modification. The Mosaic doctrine of sin, seeing that it was developed with full consciousness of that which had afterwards to be accomplished (Gen. iii. 15), deserves amongst Christian doctrines a place co-ordinate with the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, which again refers back to it. The development of Christian doctrine which still advances toward completion, in its dependence upon divine revelation, properly commences with the story of the fall, which, while once and for ever completing the Christian doctrine of sin, contained already the glorious hope of restoration when the fulness of the times should come.

JOHN MACPHERSON.

---

## ART. III.—*The Synagogue and the Church.*

### III. MODERN MISSIONS.

THE first attempt at anything like organised missionary labour among the Jews, was made in the beginning of the eighteenth century. It proceeded from Halle, the birthplace also of that spirit of Christian love which sent the earliest message of the Cross to India.

On one of his periodical evangelizing journeys, Franke visited an old and venerable preacher of the truth, Pastor Johann Müller of Gotha, whose heart was filled with love for Israel, and who had been long endeavouring to remove the veil of unbelief from the minds of those Jews with whom he came in contact. He had written a little work, setting forth the true nature of redemption through Christ, which had met with much acceptance among Jews. Encouraged by his success, he prepared a second tractate, entitled, "Light at Eventide," which he desired to print with Hebrew characters, but in the German language. His own name he had translated into Johanan Kimchi on the title-page, and as a celebrated Rabbi was so called, a wide circulation of the book was expected. But the cost of publication was too great for the old man's limited means. The procuring of the funds necessary for printing was the beginning of the first Jewish mission.

Franke's enthusiasm was fired by the venerable pastor's simple tale of his efforts among the Jews, and his heartfelt zeal in the cause. On his return to Halle, he made the ingathering of Israel the theme of a discourse before his students, and succeeded in turning the thoughts of a youth called Callenberg into the desired channel. This young student began to meditate upon the state of Israel, cast out and scattered among the nations, and upon the promise shadowed forth in Scripture of a glorious restoration. Ultimately he resolved to devote himself entirely to this work, to which God seemed to be calling him, and to do what one man could to hasten the consummation. Soon after his appointment to a chair in the university, Callenberg set out for Gotha to visit Müller, and confer with him upon the matter which now lay nearest to both their hearts. The "Light at Eventide" still lay imprisoned in manuscript in the old pastor's desk. He shewed it to his visitor, with the sorrowful remark that he had now no hope of ever seeing it in print. "God will find a way," replied the younger and more hopeful professor. He put the MS. in his pocket, and returned to Halle, resolved to collect from his friends money enough to defray the cost of its publication. This preliminary difficulty was soon removed; but a new and unlooked for one arose. It was impossible to find in Halle a

compositor able to set Hebrew type. Finally a physician called Fromman, himself a converted Israelite, undertook the task, and after many failures succeeded in setting up the work. With one of the first copies that left the press in their hands, the two friends, Fromman and Callenberg, hastened to Gotha to convey the joyful news to the aged author. But they found him on his deathbed, and were forbidden to enter his room, until Fromman, as a physician, obtained admittance. Approaching the bed of the dying man, he said, "Here is your little book, 'Light at Eventide;' it is printed at last." The old man was roused from his stupor by the strange voice, and a look of happiness spread over his countenance on hearing the joyful news. Clasping his hands, he murmured, "May God send salvation to the house of Israel!" and so passed into his rest.

The report which Callenberg drew up regarding the disposition of the funds he had collected for the publication, drew the attention of the Christian community to the subject. Further subscriptions began to flow into the treasury, and the young professor soon found himself in a position, not only to undertake the publication of other works of a similar character, but also to open an institute for the training of young men for missionary work among the Jews. Thus, in 1728, the "Callenberg Jewish and Mohammedan Institute" was founded, the earliest establishment of the kind within the Protestant Church. The first missionaries who went forth were Magister Wiedmann and Candidate Manitius, who, from 1730 till 1735, travelled and taught among the Jews in Poland, Bohemia, Germany, Denmark, and England. In 1736, they were joined by Stephen Schultz, who speedily became the most noted labourer of his age in the Hebrew vineyard. This extraordinary man has described in his book, "The Leadings of the Most High according to His Counsel," his own wonderful calling to the work, with his no less wonderful training for it, and the success that attended his labours in various lands. His eager spirit was not satisfied with the narrow bounds of Europe. He resolved to preach Christ in every country of the world; and in 1752 actually set out with his friend and fellow-labourer, Woltersdorf, on a missionary tour round the globe. They journeyed through Austria, crossed the Adriatic, visited the islands of the Archipelago, laboured for a time in

Smyrna and along the banks of the Euphrates, reaching Palestine in 1755. Here Woltersdorf sickened and died, and Schultz, feeling the need of rest, and longing for Christian fellowship, set out for home. He arrived in Halle in October the following year, and in an address delivered before an immense assembly gathered to welcome him, told the story of his wanderings and labours from the text, "The harvest is great, but the labourers are few."

Callenberg died in 1760, and Schultz, who had now been employed for twenty years in active missionary work, undertook the direction of the Institute as his successor. Through all the distress and confusion of the Seven Years' War, he presided over the mission with consummate wisdom and zeal. His successor in the office, on his death in 1776, was the learned and pious Beyer, who directed the work till 1792, when the Institute was finally abandoned. During the sixty-four years of its existence, twenty trained misssionaries had left its walls to bear to Israel the message of the Cross. These messengers of peace had been indefatigable in their zeal, and, always brave in the face of danger and patient in the endurance of tribulation, had carried, through many vicissitudes, the banner of the Lord over three quarters of the globe. Schultz alone had journeyed over thirty thousand miles of land and sea, and had preached the Gospel in at least twenty languages.

Still the Callenberg mission left few, if any, durable traces behind it. No great array of converts survived its fall to testify to the truth it had proclaimed. Numerous proselytes had been made, but they had been absorbed into the mass of the Church; and among them were none of talents so commanding or position so eminent as to perpetuate the memory of their conversion, or create any general interest in the class from which they had sprung. Only the porch of the house of Israel had been visited. Only the blind and halt and maimed, who sat begging by the wayside, had heard the tidings. The wide halls of Judaism had not yet echoed to the sound of the Gospel. The deep heart of the nation had not yet been moved to believe the report, and still beat in enmity to Christ. Still, a beginning had been accomplished. The fountain of Christian love had been broken open, and Christian effort had begun to beat in gentle force against the

rocks which Judaism opposes to the Messiah's entrance into His own kingdom. In a subsequent age the stream was to broaden and flow in stronger current, to sweep away the barriers, and flood the wilderness with the knowledge of Christ as the waters cover the sea.

The second half of the sixteenth century had witnessed a complete revolution in the relation hitherto subsisting between the Church and the Synagogue in Germany. We have already alluded to the effects produced by the Reformation in opening up fields of intellectual effort to all comers, and, by bringing Jewish and Christian scholars together on a common platform of philosophy and letters, breaking down the old barriers of distrust and hatred which had so long separated the two parties. In the period now under review, the influences in this direction became stronger through the working of a new set of causes, which, though themselves indirect products of the Reformation, were nevertheless political rather than philosophical or religious in their character. Doctrines of liberty and equality began to be much in men's thoughts and mouths over all Europe in that age, and, especially in North Germany, went like leaven through every class in the community. In the Protestant States these principles found easy and ready application to the case of the Jews. It became fashionable in the literary circles of Berlin and other German capitals, to adopt a tone not unfrequently of excessive sympathy and toleration towards the Hebrews. Jewish scholars began to find access to *salons* which had hitherto been obstinately closed against them, and were petted and caressed even by those who had formerly been bitterly hostile and contemptuous. It was only natural that they should soon begin to adopt more and more the peculiar tone and culture of the age. Some of them even became leaders in the great social movement. Gradually the more advanced among them began to abandon those doctrines and observances of their faith and worship which were in most glaring contrast with Christian customs. Thus there arose within the Jewish community a new sect of "Reformed Jews," the members of which, in Germany at least, now far outnumber the ancient orthodox party, and preponderate also in point of rank and social influence. This new party has discarded the time-honoured name of synagogue for their

places of worship, adopting instead the term temple. Their preachers discourse in German, and their sermons are not only modelled after the Christian pattern in point of form, but approach the latter very closely in subject-matter also. In point of fact, there is very little difference between the moral teaching of the reformed Jewish and that of the modern rationalistic Christian pulpit. A temple Jew would feel perfectly at home in almost any modern Unitarian church.

This entire movement was the outcome, not of any deeply-felt religious want, but of the social and humanistic revolution of the age. The system of the Synagogue was re-cast, not to meet the just and proper requirements of a progressive theology, or on account of new light which a purified Christianity had thrown upon the old fundamental truths still retained by Judaism, but to get rid of the appearance of superstition, to free themselves from the charge of bigotry, and to place themselves in the same rank with their Gentile fellow-citizens in liberal culture and enlightened progress. Rationalism, therefore, and not religious sentiment, had prompted the change from the old to the new paths.

Hence it is not strange that when the original motive forces ceased to act, the Jewish Reformation entered upon a fresh phase, and produced quite another set of phenomena. The more eager spirits in the new party failed to find in the mongrel system they had elaborated, and which lacked both the earnestness of Synagogue orthodoxy and the vitality and truth of Christianity, the satisfaction they had expected. As, on the one hand, they could not recede from the position they had assumed, and, on the other, shrank from any further advance along a path which they instinctively felt must ultimately land them in Christianity, they gradually turned to other sources for the satisfaction which their spirits craved. With many, art took the place of religion. Others sought for change in the troubled sea of politics.[1] A few found refuge in the wide fields of philosophic speculation. The vast majority sank into that slough of materialistic infidelity which seems in

[1] The Jews gained about this time a place in the politics of Europe which they have managed to retain till the present hour. At the present moment they wield enormous influence in many European States. The Premier of England is a Jew. In France the late Minister of Public Worship and Education, Jules Simon, and the Ex-Director, Gambetta, are Jews. The

most cases to be the normal transition stage between error and truth for communities as well as for individuals.

Our space does not permit us to refer at any length to the more remarkable names that marked and guided this reform movement among the Jews. We only stay to instance those of Moses Mendelsohn and David Friedländer. The former was one of the noblest spirits whom Judaism has ever produced. He was born in 1729, and, notwithstanding the extreme poverty with which he had to contend in his youth, entered with zest into the religious and philosophic speculations of his age. He advanced far within the lines of Christianity, but could never be persuaded to enter the camp itself, though his Christian friends, and especially Lavater, made strenuous efforts to induce him. In his *Reply* to Dohm he takes occasion to explain and set forth in clear terms his peculiar standpoint with reference both to Judaism and Christianity. If he cannot be claimed as a Christian, he was certainly not a Jew in any ordinary sense of the term. His children all embraced Christianity during their father's lifetime, and he made no effort to restrain them, nor evinced any sorrow at their desertion of the Synagogue.

Friedländer's case is even more deserving of note than that of Mendelsohn. He was the first to suggest a compromise between the two religions. In an *Epistle* addressed by him to Probst Teller of Berlin, he proposes that the Jews should be permitted to enter the Christian Church and take rank among its members, on condition of their abandoning certain specific doctrines and observances, and carrying out certain reforms in their organisation. But he stipulates that they should not be compelled to submit to baptism. Teller was an extreme Rationalist in his views, and, had the issue depended on himself, would no doubt have fallen in with this proposal. But the appeal having been addressed to him in his official character, he was obliged to negative it. Both sides recognised its unsatisfactory character, and the crude attempt to bring about a union of the Church with the Synagogue was speedily

most powerful statesman in the new German Empire, next to Prince Bismarck, is Lasker the Jew, the enlightened and humane leader of the National-Liberal party in the Imperial Diet. In the little Hanseatic Republic of Hamburg *more than two-thirds* of the members of the House of Representatives are Jews. And many other instances might be quoted.

forgotten. Like Mendelsohn's children, Friedländer's also became Christians during his lifetime.

One of Mendelsohn's descendants deserves special notice. His daughter Dorothea married in the first instance a Jewish merchant called Simon Veit. But the prosaic life and mean intellectual capacity of her husband filled her soul with loathing. She succeeded in obtaining a divorce from him, and became the wife of Friedrich Schlegel, with whom she entered into all the speculations and wild theories of the Romantic School, then in the full vigour of its curious influence. With her husband she joined the Roman Catholic Church at Cologne in 1803, apparently with perfect sincerity of conviction. Somewhat older than Schlegel, she exercised extraordinary influence over his wild erratic genius. Through all the vicissitudes of her eventful life, she never forgot the noble womanly modesty which was her strongest characteristic, and which sometimes hid her splendid talents from the notice and appreciation they deserved. Most of her works were published anonymously. Her two sons by her first marriage, Philip and John Emanuel Veit, inherited their mother's genius, and left a deep mark on the age in which they lived.

Other instances might be cited of noble women of the house of Israel who influenced strongly the current of religious thought in Germany during the earlier part of the present century. We shall only refer to one case, that of Henrietta Herz. The name of this eminent daughter of Israel is inseparably linked with that of Schleiermacher. She contributed not a little to shape the life and direct the labours of the father of the second reformation, and exercised great influence over many others of the most distinguished men of the time. The daughter of a Jewish physician, De Lemos, she became the wife, at a comparatively early age, of Marcus Herz, also a physician, and a man of considerable philosophic repute in his day. On the death of her husband she devoted herself to philosophy and works of benevolence. Her beauty and genius soon made her *salons* the favourite resort of the most eminent scholars and men of letters in Berlin. At her receptions the social and political problems of the age were freely discussed; religious topics especially were handled with the earnestness and thoroughness of men who instinctively felt themselves to be shaping a new epoch in the religious history of their country.

Frau Herz took a prominent part in these discussions, and though at first disposed to regard Christianity rather as an æsthetico-philosophical system than as a system of revealed truth, yet her mind gradually opened to the true meaning of the gospel of the cross, and her heart at length recognised Jesus as the Messiah. After long testing the depth and reality of her new convictions, she publicly embraced Christianity. It may be noted as characteristic of the influence she had acquired over Schleiermacher, that each of the *Reden über die Religion* was submitted to her criticism in manuscript before being published, and in not a few instances alterations were made at her suggestion. We believe they were all delivered prior to her conversion. The curious spectacle, strongly illustrative of the new spirit which was beginning to breathe over both Church and Synagogue, is thus exhibited of the greatest Christian thinker of his age, the peer of Augustine and Calvin, the man who broke the force of Rationalism and inaugurated a revival of religion in Germany, taking counsel with a Jewess over the work of Christian philosophy which was destined to introduce the new and brighter era.

It cannot be denied, however, that whilst in the latter part of last century and the first half of the present one, many noble Jewish spirits entered the Christian Church through the portals of philosophy, yet the vast majority of those Jews whom the peculiar *Zeitgeist* of the period had carried away from their ancient Hebrew moorings, failed to reach the haven of gospel faith, and were engulphed in the waves of scepticism. Even among those who professed to believe, there were many who had embraced Christianity solely on account of the improved social position which rewarded their proselytism. A certain *moral* pressure, and the prospect of obtaining social advantage, led many into the Christian fold during the *renaissance* period in Germany; much in the same way as the *physical* pressure of persecution had swelled the ranks of the Church in the middle ages. It must be confessed that many of these modern proselytes may fitly be compared with the new-Christians of the olden time, only with this difference, that whereas the new-Christians of a former period held fast in secret to their ancient faith, their modern representatives have abandoned all creeds, Talmudic as well as Christian, and adopted instead of religion the principles of a false and misnamed liberalism.

But what persecution and physical violence could not do in the middle ages, and what moral pressure and so-called culture failed to accomplish in more modern times, is in our own day being achieved by the spirit of love that has been shed abroad more abundantly in Christian hearts. The Church has learned the use of a weapon unknown to our fathers; and through her various missionary organisations is putting forth a power which must, sooner or later, compel the proud fortress of Judaism to yield, and open wide its gates, that the King of glory may come in.

It only now remains for us, in drawing our paper to a close, to glance briefly at these most recent efforts to convey to Israel the message of salvation. The brightest page in the history of the *diaspora* opens before us. But our space forbids detail, and we shall only attempt to give the more prominent lines of the picture.

Generally speaking, two extreme theories divide the suffrages of the Church regarding the propriety of mission work among the Jews. It is held, on the one hand, by a large section, of which the late Pastor Harms of Hermannsburg may be taken as the exponent, that all missionary enterprise among them is both hopeless and superfluous. To use Harms' own words, published in the *Hermannsburger Missionsblatt* for 1861:

"The Jews, having rejected the Lord Jesus, are now in their turn rejected by Him; they have ceased to be God's chosen people. They are blinded, and their blindness shall continue till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. It is utterly useless to preach to them. Those individuals who have come in, and are still coming, do so of their own accord. They have everywhere opportunities enough; they live in the midst of Christendom, and the Churches are all open to them."

On the other hand, the view which obtains most widely in the churches of England is, that the Jews shall yet again take the chief place, and play the most decisive part, in the developement of the Messiah's kingdom. Hence, mission work among them is the imperative duty, and ought to be a chief concern of Christians in an age like the present, in which the eschatological elements of Scripture-teaching are coming to the surface, and being fulfilled with such startling rapidity. Those who entertain this theory usually couple with it the prospect of a speedy return of Israel to their own

land, of Jerusalem being rebuilt and becoming the seat of a Jewish-Christian Church, that shall be the centre of Christendom, and out of which shall flow streams of refreshing over the whole Gentile world; with many other apocalyptic millenarian fancies.

The former theory is sufficiently refuted, we think, by pointing to the words of St Paul in the tenth chapter of Romans: "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" God hath not cast away His ancient people; and surely the removal of the temporary curse which has fallen upon them is fit matter for Christian prayer, and the proclamation among them of the Healer a proper task for Christian labour.

The second view is equally unwarranted by Scripture, and in some of its results not a little mischievous in practice. Those who hold it are given to a fanciful interpretation of the Word of God, which produces a nerveless sentimental millenarian theology, raises quite a false issue in the question, and paralyses Christian effort in no small degree. The establishment of a Jewish-Christian Church in Jerusalem, giving to Jews a pre-eminence in grace, and placing them above their Gentile fellow-believers, thus creating, in point of fact, a hereditary aristocracy among the saints of God, is utterly irreconcilable with that sure word of apostolic prophecy which describes the Messianic Church of the future as a community in which all shall be of God, and no distinction possible between Jew and Gentile.

We think the truth lies in the middle between the two. Israel is not cast off for ever. Missionary enterprise among them is not hopeless, for "all Israel shall be saved." When the ingathering to the Christian fold shall take place, or by what means, or in what order, has not been revealed. But the analogy of Jehovah's dealings with them in wrath hitherto would seem to point to a gradual leavening of the mass of the nation with gospel truth, a quickening, revivifying process carried on by the Spirit of God breathing upon the dry bones, and a gradual return to the old-new paths that shall extend over many years. Just as the whole curse was not pronounced

or inflicted in a moment, but was spread over long periods of time, so also its removal shall take place, not in the twinkling of an eye, as our chiliastic interpreters of Scripture expect, but by a developing series of events, some of which, however, may exceed others in largeness of importance and outline, in the same way as the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the people stand out most prominently as landmarks in the dispensation of judgment. In the meantime the duty of the Christian Church and the hopefulness of the work are clear. Let the Gospel of the Cross be preached to the Jews just as to the other lapsed bodies of men who have wandered far from the truth; always in the consciousness, however, that a special blessing of success has been promised to the labourer in Zion, and that God has yet a great work to accomplish on earth through the agency of Jacob His servant, whom for that end He has preserved intact and separate among the nations. What Israel's mission in the future shall be has been shadowed forth by St Paul in his epistle to the Romans. When the Lord visits and redeems His people, He will have a whole nation prepared to do His will—a vast army of servants spread over the earth, speaking all languages, at home in every land, ready to begin at once the proclamation of the truth when they shall have learned its deep import for themselves. Surely the ingathering of Israel shall be for the heathen world in that day as life from the dead.

Organised and continuous missionary enterprise among the Jews may be dated from the beginning of the present century. The London Society for the propagation of the Gospel among them was the first to take the field in 1809. The story of its origin reads like a romance. In 1808 the celebrated Lewis Way, when riding with a friend in Devonshire, had his attention drawn by his companion to some stately trees in a park they were passing. "Do you know," said his friend, "the singular condition that is attached to those oaks? A lady who formerly owned this park stipulated in her will that they should not be cut down until Jerusalem should again be in the possession of Israel, and they are growing still." Way's heart was deeply moved by the incident. The idea of the restoration of the Jews took possession of his mind. In the following year he succeeded in forming the London Society, among whose earliest members were Dr Simeon of Cambridge,

Dr Marsh of Birmingham, Leigh Richmond, and the pious Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria. The efforts of the infant society were at first confined to the Jews of London, and for their benefit the Episcopal Jews' chapel was built in 1803, the Duke of Kent laying the foundation-stone. The work soon extended beyond the limits of England. Way travelled over most of the continent of Europe, everywhere endeavouring—in some cases with marked success—to create in Christian hearts an interest in the cause. At the commencement the society was non-sectarian in its constitution, but in 1815 circumstances occurred which compelled dissenters to retire from it, and begin an independent agency. Notwithstanding the somewhat exclusive and narrow spirit which informs its management, the London Society is richly blessed in its labours and fruitful in success beyond all others. The field of its operations is divided into three districts. The first of these embraces England, with London, Liverpool, Manchester, and Bristol as main centres. The second consists of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The third comprises Frankfort-on-the-Maine, Kreuznach, Strasburg, Colmar and Mühlhausen in Alsace, and Paris. These, however, are only the chief stations of the mission, which extends its operations far beyond the limits of Europe to Africa and Asia.

The Berlin Society for the advancement of Christianity among the Jews may be regarded as an offshoot from the London parent stem. It was founded in 1822, and owes its origin to a visit which Lewis Way paid to Berlin in 1818, on which occasion he succeeded in enlisting the sympathies of Sir George Rose, at that time English ambassador to the Prussian court, Professor Tholuck, and other warm-hearted friends for the cause. The Berlin Association has labourers in various parts of Germany and the East.

In August 1841 a proposal was made to Queen Victoria by the pious Frederick William IV. of Prussia, which deserves special notice. Chevalier Bunsen was deputed to visit the English court, and, in the name of his royal master, invite the Queen and Christian people of England to unite with Germany in sending the Gospel to the Jews in Palestine. A nobler envoy, with a nobler message, never passed between the two courts. "Go," said the pious monarch to Bunsen on his departure, "and tell the Christians of England that I

proffer them the hand of Christian union across the grave of our common Redeemer." The negotiations on the subject were carried on with the utmost heartiness and speed. The new bishopric of St James of Jerusalem was established, and the first bishop, Dr Alexander, departed from England to begin his labours in November, just four months after the project had been first mooted. It was agreed that the bishops of Jerusalem should be alternately an Englishman and a German. The expense of the work is borne equally by the two countries, and marked success has followed the undertaking. Already more than twelve hundred proselytes have been baptized in the church on Mount Zion;[1] and the influence of the mission is felt by the Mahommedans throughout the entire country. This union of the two great Protestant powers of Europe for the conversion of Israel caused consternation at the court of Rome. Strenuous efforts were made—for a time with success—to induce the Porte to oppose the work. The Pope in hot haste despatched a rival bishop to Jerusalem, conferring upon him the somewhat equivocal title of Bishop *in partibus* of Babylon. As an observant critic remarked on the occasion, "it is not the first time that the enemy has foretold the judgment of God without knowing it, and the Popes, dipping their pens in the ink of prophecy, written their doom upon their own foreheads."

To the Church of Scotland belongs the high honour of having been the first Protestant Church in Christendom to engage *as a Church* in the work of Jewish missions. The attention of its General Assembly was called to the subject in 1838; and in the spring of the following year a deputation, consisting of Drs Keith and Black, with Mr Bonar and the sainted M'Cheyne, was sent to visit and inquire into the condition of the Jews of Europe and Palestine. These commissioners visited most of the cities along the coast of the Mediterranean where Jews were congregated in the largest numbers, and arrived in the Holy Land in the month of June. Their return journey lay by Smyrna and Constantinople, up the banks of the Danube, through the different principalities, to Pomerania and the cities of Berlin and Hamburg. They were received everywhere in the most friendly manner by the

[1] Mr Ayerst's speech at the Conference of Jewish Missionaries in Berlin in 1870.

Jews. The report of their expedition was published in 1842, and a French translation appeared at Paris in 1844. Mission stations were established at Jassy and Pesth. During the stormy Disruption period the good work was neither forgotten nor abandoned. The missionaries sent out by the Established Church cast in their lot with the young and vigorous Free Church of Scotland, which carries on the work with unabated zeal till the present day. On the continent of Europe its agents are faithfully and successfully labouring in Breslau, Prague, Pesth, and Amsterdam.

The Irish Presbyterian Church was moved to enter the Jewish field in 1842. The first missionary sent out by it selected Damascus as the scene of his labours. At present, the Irish Jewish Mission has agents labouring, as the God of Israel gives them opportunity, in Damascus, Hamburg, Bonn, Vienna, and Venice. Professor Rogers of Belfast is the director of the work.

The Rhenish-Westphalian Society came into existence also in 1842. It may be regarded as another offshoot from the London Society. Its efforts are confined, we believe, to the provinces watered by the Rhine. In 1857 it had no missionary engaged in actual service.

In 1843 the British Society began its operations. Its management is confined to dissenters of various denominations. Its agents, who are all converted Israelites, have had much success in France and Germany, and especially in London.

The Evangelical Lutheran Society in Bavaria is also deserving of notice. Missionary Goldberg, one of its agents, was one of the most zealous and successful labourers who ever proclaimed the gospel to Israel. He was indefatigable in visiting and reasoning with the Jews scattered over the towns and villages of Saxony and Bohemia. At the great annual fairs at Leipzig, he often succeeded in getting thousands of Jews to listen to his preaching. It was through him that Professor Delitzsch's mind was first turned to the importance of the work. The latter is now at the head of a society for conveying to his own brethren after the flesh the gospel of a crucified Saviour. Goldberg died in 1848, and a sketch of his life and labours, by Hansmeister, was published in the same year.

Time would fail us to mention all the societies and auxiliaries that have taken up the work within the last few years. Suffice it to say, that nearly every evangelical church in Europe and America is employed, in one way or another, in organized missionary enterprise among the Jews; and Christian people are everywhere manifesting increasing interest in the subject.

Notwithstanding the short period during which these messengers of peace to Israel have been engaged in their work, the fruits already gathered by them, comparatively speaking, far outnumber those reaped in any other field of Christian enterprise. The number of Jews existing throughout the world has been estimated at about seven millions. We believe this computation to be excessive, but shall assume its accuracy. Though mission work among them is as yet in its infancy, and, though the messenger to Israel has difficulties to encounter and obstacles to surmount of which his colleague in the Gentile field knows nothing, there are at present over *twenty thousand* converted and baptized Jews enrolled in the membership of Christian Churches, and in the enjoyment of Christian privileges. To these must be added an immense multitude whom no man can number who are in their hearts Christians, but who, "fearing the Jews," have not been baptized or made any other public profession of their faith. But the point of largest importance in estimating the success of missionary labour among them is that, of the twenty thousand converts to Christianity, *more than three hundred are men occupying influential positions as ministers, theological professors, and teachers in the Christian Church.* In England alone no fewer than one hundred and ten of these are ministers of the Established Church;[1] not to mention the numerous instances in which Presbyterian and Dissenting pulpits are also filled by converted Jews. In the professorial ranks of Germany are numbered among the bravest and most devoted servants of Christ, several Jews who have won for themselves high reputation as commentators and expounders of Scripture. It is worthy of note that some of the brightest centres of evangelical light in Germany are the universities where Jewish-Christian doctors occupy chairs.[2]

[1] Also stated by Mr Ayerst at the Conference already referred to.

[2] Compare the writer's article in the *Missionary Herald* of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, April 1872.

Great as has been the success of Jewish missions hitherto, we believe it might in some portions of the field, if not in all, be largely increased by a partial re-organization of the agencies employed.

1. In the first place, the employment of trained evangelists or experienced colporteurs, instead of college-bred ordained missionaries, would result in a large increase of efficiency. Trained evangelists can be had in almost any numbers, and at one-fourth of the cost necessary to send out properly equipped labourers of the higher grade. These men can make their way into Jewish houses and find an attentive hearing where the door would be shut in the clergyman's face. It is a fallacy to suppose that high linguistic attainments are needed in dealing with Jews. The great majority of the reformed Jews in Germany are ignorant of Hebrew, and are to be reached in precisely the same way and by the same means as the so-called "lapsed masses" in our larger towns. Even in the case of those who still retain their ancient tongue, an evangelist would, we believe, prove the more efficient agent. What is wanted is not a learned discussion of hermeneutical points, but the plain unvarnished story of the gospel; and this can be told to the Jew far more effectively, as we know from experience, by the simple evangelist than by an ordained missionary, whom in nine cases out of ten he regards with distrust as a mere professional teacher.

2. The agents labouring among the Jews of Protestant countries should be under the inspection and subject to the direction of *local* clergymen, acting in correspondence with and representing the society. Among the Lutheran clergy in every district of Germany men could easily be found in whose evangelical sentiments and Christian zeal any church in Europe might place implicit confidence, and who would willingly undertake the responsibility of such inspection. These local volunteer agents could supplement, moreover, the teachings of the evangelists where it might be needed, and the catechumens could be baptized in their churches and adopted into their congregations. Thus, too, the missing link of pastoral oversight and Christian encouragement for the proselytes would be supplied. The adoption of this plan of *local* inspection would tend in no small degree to remove the jealousy, in some cases highly justifiable, with which Lutheran pastors sometimes

witness the evangelistic labours of strangers within their parishes. We have no hesitation in saying that no evangelist, whether ordained or not, should enter upon his work in any Protestant district without first making himself and his errand known to the pastor of the place. In many places mischief has been done and much good work crippled by not observing this rule.

3. A central institute, under the immediate charge of the Committee, ought, we think, to be the crown of every well-organised Jewish Mission Society. Not for the reception of all proselytes without exception. The case of the majority would be sufficiently met by their introduction to the Christian fellowship of individual congregations in the way indicated above. But every missionary knows that among those who seek his instruction, men occasionally present themselves whom a short training, under careful direction, would convert into most efficient messengers to their brethren. These men, in order to be trained for work, should be removed from the scenes and society, and temptations of the old life, and received into an institute, where they could be educated in historical theology, and imbibe a true missionary spirit. The cost of such an establishment need not be great, and the training process ought not to be protracted.

It is with great diffidence that we venture to make these suggestions. We are convinced that their adoption, in those cases where Jewish mission work is carried on in Protestant countries (and our remarks refer to no other), would produce a largely increased efficiency of the means employed,—by quadrupling the number of agents in the field, by removing some of the present hindrances to success, and by providing nurseries of earnest and well-qualified labourers for the future.

Looking abroad over the wide realm of Judaism in our own time, and noting the effect produced upon it by the various intellectual and spiritual forces of the age, it is impossible to avoid coming to the conclusion that the time is ripe for the Christian Church to engage with greater energy than it has ever yet shewn in the task of conveying to Israel the gospel of the Cross. The political enlightenment of this century, and the broader and more liberal culture which is spreading fast over Europe, and, more than anything else, the revived

evangelical Christianity of the age, have brought the Church and the Synagogue into a new and closer contact with each other, and opened up a wide door for the truth to enter the house of Israel. During the last few years, many symptoms have appeared among the Jews betokening that a crisis of some kind is at hand. Their leaders have proclaimed that something is wrong in the Jewish camp, and have been holding synods to devise means for checking the evil. The principal organ of the Jews in Germany, the *Berliner Israelitische Wochenschrift*, is generally full of lamentations over the woful decline of the ancient religion in these degenerate days. The rising generation do not regard the traditional oracles with such loyal faith and unswerving allegiance as their fathers. Jewish children find their way, in ever-increasing numbers, into Christian schools. To quote the language of the journal before us:

"In all places where there is anything to be seen or heard, the number of Jews seems daily to increase. In the cafés, promenades, theatres, concerts, and balls, one sees almost more Jews than Christians; and if you wish to visit a place where Christians are to be found oftener, and in greater numbers than Jews, you must go to the new Synagogue in Berlin."

Complaint is made that wealthy Israelites no longer practise charity towards their poorer brethren; and the charge is also brought against them of increasing indifference towards their ancestral faith, as shewn by the frequent marriages which take place "between poverty-stricken Christian nobles and rich Jewish heiresses." Respecting the education of the young, it is asserted:

"It is absolutely certain that in Berlin not a fourth, probably not a tenth, of the children attending the higher schools ever receive a word of instruction regarding the doctrines of their religion after their thirteenth year;" and the note of warning is sounded: "If you continue to educate Jews without Judaism, you will have '*Jews*' only in the sense which fanatical hatred has assigned to the term."

It is only natural that earnest orthodox Jews should ascribe these evils to the growing influence of the schismatic Reform party. But the measures which are being adopted to stem the tide of defection, abundantly prove that the leaders, at least, recognise in their hearts a greater danger to Judaism from the progress of Christianity than from the increase of rationalism among themselves. In many places—e. g. in

Chicago, in Cincinnati, and in Cleveland, Jewish Rabbis have been delivering public lectures against Christianity and the Church, defending Judaism with a bitterness and zeal never before manifested in the history of the controversy. An "Anti-Jewish Mission Society" has lately been formed at Birmingham, with a Polish Jew named Stern for its agent, with the special commission to discredit Christianity among his brethren, and to throw all possible hindrances in the way of missionary enterprise among them. In Germany the press is actively employed in the same direction. It is curious to note what these defenders of the ancient faith have to say about Christianity. A recent article admits that the latter has found an entrance among the nations to the displacement of Judaism, "because it accommodated itself, at the outset, to Paganism, and has always shewn itself ready to submit to fresh modifications." In another article, which extols the Bible as the basis of civilisation, "the book of Humanity," it is asserted of the New Testament: "Everything in it that is capable of general application in the furtherance of civilisation, has been borrowed from the sacred books of the Jews. Its specifically Christian dogmatic teaching has not advanced 'Humanity,' and is incapable of doing so."

The efforts of some of the members of the "Protestantenverein" to infuse new life and vigour into a dead or dying rationalism, are hailed by Jewish publicists on all hands with delight. Herr Philippson says, "We Jews can only rejoice to see a widespread rationalism obtaining among Christians, for every one must perceive how closely allied it is with the doctrinal purport of our own religion."

In the month of June in 1869 a Jewish Synod was held in Leipzig for the purpose of devising some common scheme by which the danger which is instinctively felt to be threatening Judaism might be averted. Representatives of the Jewish communities in seventy of the principal cities in Germany took part in the meeting. Among the delegates were men of every school of Jewish thought. After a lengthened and somewhat animated debate, two very significant conclusions were unanimously arrived at: 1st, That those passages of the Old Testament which contain prayers for vengeance on their enemies should henceforth be omitted from their services; and 2d, That the prayers for a speedy return to Palestine and

the re-building of Jerusalem should be discontinued. It was, moreover, resolved that a great central Jewish university should be established, in order to give a tone to the teaching and philosophy of all Jewish schools throughout the country. This latter purpose has been carried out. There was opened a short time ago at Berlin, amid enthusiastic rejoicings, and with a pompous inaugural oration by Philippson, the "Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums." The new Institute is intended to gather together and unite on one common and therefore very broad platform all shades and phases of Jewish belief, and to meet the wants of modern Judaism in religion, philosophy, and letters. As yet, however, its success has not been very marked. The appointment of Dr Geiger, one of the most radical reformers, on the one hand, and of Dr Lewy, an ultra-Conservative, on the other, to be members of the teaching body, has not given satisfaction; and as yet only eighteen students have been enrolled.

Within the last two years a considerable number of local societies or clubs for Jews have been formed throughout Germany. These associations bear the high-sounding title of "Moses-Mendelsohn-Vereinen," are "under the auspices and names of the two greatest men and reformers of our race in ancient and modern times—Moses and Mendelsohn," and are intended as centres of union "for all Jews to whom Judaism is dear, and worthy of maintenance and extension." It is worthy of note, that their constitution and management are closely modelled after the pattern of the "Protestantenverein." Somewhat similar to these societies is the *Alliance israelite universelle*, of which Sir Moses Montefiore and M. Cremieux are the leaders, and which has for its object the support of poor Jews in the *diaspora* and the furtherance of Jewish emigration from the western provinces of Russia. It is international in its operations.

These facts abundantly shew that the field is open, as it never was before, for missionary effort among the Jews. The dissensions among the leaders of the Synagogue, and the measures which they are everywhere adopting, ostensibly to meet evils quite unconnected with Christianity, but in reality to prevent further defection, are sure signs of the whitening harvest. Missionaries labouring among the Jews in Germany

report large numbers on every hand who, mourning over the present condition of Judaism in matters of faith, are yearning for light to arise amid the gathering gloom, and asking, half eagerly, half despondently, What is truth?

Some eighteen centuries have passed away since the Gentiles, pressing into the kingdom, took it by force. They scaled the heights of Zion, and, thronging in through the temple gates, took possession of the holy precincts, with the ancient altar and the sacred fire. Borrowing the flame, they lighted the torch of Christianity, and went forth in haste to illumine the whole earth with its glory. They have carried it through many lands, and kindled the fires of faith and hope and love among many peoples. The beams of the true Light have penetrated to the darkest homes of heathendom. But during the long interval of so many centuries Zion has sat in darkness. Thick clouds have swept around her, casting gloom over the brilliant memories of the past, and quenching her hopes for the future. Her sons are still sorrowfully groping among the ashes of their former fires for some spark to kindle a fresh flame, and vainly endeavouring to build up again their broken altar. Surely the time has come for Gentiles, whose salvation has been of the Jews, to carry back to a desolate Zion the light and warmth which they originally borrowed from its hearth.

JOHN C. MOORE.

---

## ART. IV.—*Is Christianity Superseded?*

IT may without cavil be asserted that, with the exception of the Apostles and Reformers, no theologian—if in this instance we can use the term theologian—of any age has exerted a more powerful influence on his own time than he who died at Ludwigsburg a few months ago. The effect produced on theological opinion by his speculations may be evanescent or permanent, but it cannot be denied that during his lifetime it has been exceptionally great. Strauss has dealt Christianity the strongest blow it has yet received, and if it is to be superseded, it will undoubtedly be succeeded by Straussism. If it be destined to endure, then the memory of

him, or at least his influence, must pass utterly away; but if it be destined to perish, he is certain of at least an earthly immortality.

Strauss was the first to recognise what really were the difficulties which had to be surmounted in order to solve the problem of accounting for Christianity on natural grounds. Opponents of Christianity of the class of Voltaire and Hume, and those usually designated by the title of the "English Deists," simply endeavoured to ignore it. The chief weapon employed by them against it was ridicule; and they did nothing more than attempt to storm a few of its outposts, thinking they might safely pursue their own devices and their own schemes of conquest, in total disregard of its existence. Such "rationalistic" writers, again, as Reimarus, Semler, Eichorn, and Paulus had only made apparent their inability to give a feasible solution of the problem. Strauss was the first to grapple with it fully, to appreciate in a somewhat adequate way its difficulties, and to meet them directly, fairly, and hand-to-hand, without either subterfuge or evasion. We should certainly, indeed, go beyond the truth if we were to affirm that the intense interest now taken in the question of the origin of Christianity is altogether due to his speculations, or to the turn which he has given to the discussion. For, in the first place, he himself owed much to his teacher, Schleiermacher, and much it may be believed to intercourse with Baur. Perhaps his first work was actually suggested by Baur's earlier and minor publications. Besides this, the general interest now taken in the subject is the product rather of the age than of any individual influence. In an age of what is called "all-sided inquiry," it could not be expected that Christianity should escape the ordeal of searching criticism and scrutiny, the more especially since the results of scientific discovery seem sometimes to necessitate conclusions hostile either to its divine claims, or to some of the arguments by which these claims have been usually supported, or to the form in which they have been conceived or expressed. Still, making every allowance for the spirit of inquiry now abroad, Strauss' first *Life of Jesus* gave quite a new aspect, quite a new importance, to the question of the origin of Christianity, and all subsequent indictments preferred against its divinity have only been the echoes, more or less

faint, of what was uttered by him in 1835. He carried what is called the "destructive criticism" to its utmost limits, and therefore his arguments have a thoroughness, consistency, and force which are lacking in all the modified forms of that criticism. Though perhaps Baur was superior to Strauss in comprehensiveness of argument, in the discernment of principles, and in historical grasp, he is not so direct or consistent in his reasoning. Besides, Strauss had published his *Life of Jesus* before Baur had begun to study the gospels; and if Baur has refuted his extreme position, his own theory, as he has left it, is on the whole less satisfactory. The erudition, labour, and ingenuity required to give his conclusions the semblance of probability, gave them also inevitably the appearance of being far-fetched. They are, as they stand, very lame conclusions; for he confessed himself after all unable to account for the unprecedented influence of Christ, and especially to explain how men came to believe in His resurrection.

Rénan has adopted somewhat the stand-point of Baur, but nevertheless enlists sometimes in his service, not only the peculiar views of Strauss, but even the "rationalistic" method of eliminating the miraculous from the historical portion of the gospel narratives, so unsparingly denounced by Strauss. His theory is therefore fundamentally contradictory and incoherent. Besides, he has undertaken to do that which Baur considered impossible—to give a full and satisfactory explanation of the origin of Christianity; and, in attempting a portraiture of Jesus, he has painted a moral impossibility. The peculiar charm of his style, the brilliant rhetoric which enlivens his discussion of even the driest details, and the poetical haze of imagery and fine sentiment which pervades all his theme, have imparted to it an outward form which is somewhat deceptive, which conceals many glaring defects and inconsistencies of argument, and sometimes the bareness and poverty of his thoughts. His books have therefore obtained a greater popularity even in Germany than those of Strauss; but unless as preparing the way for him, and enticing men unawares to become in reality his disciples, their influence, except with those who are afraid to face the naked truth, cannot be more than momentary. No one can find any permanent resting place in Rénan's Christianity. The edifice he invites us to enter in order to worship the Supreme is not

a noble temple, where the soul may commune with God, but only the bare walls of infidelity adorned with a very tawdry and flimsy drapery, which scarcely conceals the crevices through which blow continually the bitter winds of chill despair. He believes in the immortality of the soul, in some sense at least, and he places Jesus "at the highest summit of human greatness"—two things apparently inconsistent with the leading principles of the "materialistic" creed; but then it is impossible to say exactly what he means by the immortality of the soul, and when we remember the duplicity and deceit attributed by him to Jesus, it is equally impossible to know what he means by the "highest summit of human greatness."

*Ecce Homo*, at one time regarded by many as occupying a position in this country similar to that occupied by Strauss' works in Germany, and Rénan's in France, is, to use its own words, "not a book of authority, but of inquiry and suggestion." It is, besides, "only a fragment." It professedly—although it frequently violates its professions—discusses only one aspect,—if we might so distinguish, we should say the one-half only, of the question; and its author, by delaying so long to fulfil his promise to publish a sequel, treating of "Christ as the author of modern theology and religion," is beginning to invite the reproach of "having begun to build, without being unable to finish." The views of Matthew Arnold, again, though they profess to be alone able to reveal in the Bible that water of life by which men can quench the thirst of their souls in the wilderness of barren and parched materialism, which stretches to the furthest horizon of so-called modern thought, are found, when we attempt to understand them, to be nothing better than the mirages which mock the tired and thirsty traveller in eastern deserts with visions of abundant water, to which he can never make any nearer approach, and which at last wholly disappear, leaving to him only the same uninterrupted prospect of arid sand. If such writers as De Wette and Ewald (and perhaps Schleiermacher may be classed along with them, for he has many features in common) seem to occupy a more stable and secure position than those who in their views approximate more towards the position of Strauss, it is not because it is logically more tenable, but rather because they feel so equally the force of

the two opposing tendencies, that, though they can only be uncomfortable where they are, they can neither advance nor retreat without parting with truth, to them in either case equally dear. Strauss is the only one of the "destructive" critics who occupies a position logically consistent. That Christianity is an utter delusion, that its distinctive principles are essentially hostile to the best interests of mankind, and that it has only the very smallest possible foundation in fact, is the thesis which must be made good by those who would deny its divine, supernatural, and miraculous origin. Unless we adopt the mythical theory of Strauss, the difficulties in accounting for Christianity on natural grounds are insuperable. Our only choice is between it and the "rationalistic" treatment of the New Testament, with its contradictory and impossible interpretations and explanations. Indeed, unless the mythical theory can be applied, not only to the Gospels, but to all the Epistles, these difficulties are insuperable; for in all of them, and in those[1] which even Baur admits to be genuine, as much, if not more than in others, the "myth" is seen as fully developed as the most zealous Christian need desire. Unless, again, we go as far as Strauss does, in the condemnation of Christianity, unless we believe its principles fundamentally hostile to the best interests of the human race, we must recognise it as having had a divine, a supernatural origin. To yield to the so-called scientific spirit of the times so far as to deny the miraculous element in Christianity, is virtually to make an unconditional surrender. It is not merely to surrender the divinity of Christianity, but to surrender the truth of every mode of thinking and feeling which has the faintest resemblance to Christianity; not merely to deny that it contains a divine revelation, but to affirm that everything it distinctively reveals is deadly and pernicious error. This is a position which Strauss, in his last volume, has certainly made good. He has shewn—not, perhaps, directly, but it is nevertheless the gist and kernel of his book—that that modern "enlightenment" which forbids men to believe in a miracle, forbids them equally to believe in everything which makes Christianity of any value,—forbids them to believe in the existence of God and in the immortality of the soul.

In endeavouring, therefore, to answer the question, Is

[1] Romans, 1st and 2d Corinthians, and Galatians.

Christianity Superseded?—superseded, that is, by something called modern "enlightenment"—we require to consider it in its relation to these three particulars: 1st, As a religion which is founded on, or implies a supernatural or miraculous agency; 2d, Which assumes or makes known the personality of God; and, 3d, Which takes for granted, or brings to light, the immortality of the soul. These three aspects of Christianity cannot be separated; they remain or vanish together, and Christianity remains or vanishes with them. This will be illustrated in the sequel. In treating of this subject, however, we cannot confine ourselves to Strauss as the only exponent of what is called modern "enlightenment,"—that is, of the views of those whose principles in the main agree with his, and who fully agree with him in condemning Christianity. The members of that school of thought included in the "We" of Strauss are not, any more than other and inferior mortals, perfectly at one in their opinions. The same difficulty attaches to their claims to infallibility as to those of the Church of Rome,—that it is impossible to say with whom it rests, and that its decisions do not perfectly harmonise. Therefore it is necessary to indicate exceptions to, or modifications or partial contradictions of, the extreme position of Strauss, and to shew the bearing of these on the general argument.

A very ingenious, but, it must be said, insidious and deceptive, method of dealing with the question of miracles, is neither to affirm nor deny their possibility, neither to affirm nor deny that they have actually taken place, but to represent it as worse than useless, in our times, to appeal to them in defence of Christianity. It is said that the question of miracles is one which Christians, if they were wise, would not seek to raise at present, because the general current of modern thought is setting in a direction which is strongly hostile to them. If you associate Christianity too closely with them, you will, it is suggested, create a prejudice against it; if you identify it with them, you will overthrow it. Miracles, so it is said, are doomed,—that is, their influence is doomed,—not because they can actually be proved to be impossible, but because science has shewn so many things, formerly deemed miraculous, to be the results of natural causes, that there is, at least, strong presumptive evidence against them. The authority appealed

to in the matter is not testimony, not history, not direct argument, but the general tendency of modern thought. Now, it is surely a sufficient answer to such objections, to say that the spirit of this age, no more than that of any other, is infallible; that if former ages have been, perhaps in all things, too superstitious, this age is perhaps inclined, in all things, to be over-sceptical. Besides, if the spirit of this age were entirely a right one, would there be any use for Christianity? What is religion but the power which withstands the influence of the time-spirit? In the words of Mr Carlyle, "Our life is an internecine warfare with the time-spirit; other warfare seems questionable."[1] Indeed, that modern influence which would reject the miracles of Christianity, is hostile also to its fundamental truths. It must however be admitted, indeed insisted upon, that it is possible to make too prominent a use of mere miracle in its defence. Its pretensions must rest on something deeper, something which concerns man more intimately and vitally, than merely outwardly striking and wonderful occurrences. To make good its divine claims, it must not so much address itself to our sense of the marvellous, as convince our intelligence and touch our hearts. And is it not the case, that even the miracles of Christianity are not mere appeals to the vulgar sense of wonder, but constitute a portion of one great revelation of Divine compassion and love? —that every one of them, beyond the mere astonishment it excites, is fitted to instruct us regarding the character of God, and the relation in which we stand to Him? Especially, and in the highest degree, is this true of the great miracle of Christianity, the resurrection of Christ. That miracle has reference to the most momentous hopes of mankind, and by its occurrence Christianity affirms that "life and immortality have been brought to light." Strauss was certainly right when he wrote that "the precepts of Jesus would have been blown away and scattered like solitary leaves by the wind, had these leaves not been fastened, and thus preserved, as with a strong, tangible binding, by a belief" (he says an *illusory* belief) "in His resurrection." Christianity, in fact, cannot be separated from its miracles. To attempt to do so, is to mutilate it past recognition, and past the possibility of its

[1] "Sartor Resartus."

retaining even the faintest pulsation of life. It is founded on a miracle.

By saying, however, that it originated in an illusory belief in miracles, Strauss has not advanced a step nearer to a solution of his problem. The more credulous men were in those early times, the more that miracles were common occurrences, there was the less to distinguish Christianity from other creeds in this respect. The credulity argument cuts both ways. If it be the case, as it is asserted, that among eastern nations stories of corporeal resurrection are quite common, if it be no unusual thing to assert the re-appearance for short periods of sages beloved and revered before their death, and if the general atmosphere in Palestine at that time was one of credulity, why was it that the assertion of this miracle had such a unique and transcendent influence? Why could Paul with such effect appeal to the resurrection of Jesus as the only foundation of the world's hope? Why should it be received as such wonderful and glad tidings, and as stamping so unmistakeably on His earthly life and teaching the impress of divinity? There is only one answer which can be given to this question, and it is not consistent with the hypothesis that no resurrection took place. It is that it was not merely a strange and wonderful event in itself, but the final part, the completion of one revelation, that it harmonised with the life, teaching, and death of Christ, and combined them into a music, such

"As never was by mortal finger strook." [1]

Strauss, indeed, in his eagerness to discredit the resurrection, has expressed his incredulity in language so unguarded as to be utterly suicidal. He has said that, "rarely has an incredible event been worse attested, or one so ill-attested been more incredible in itself." If it be so, and if this so badly-attested and incredible fact was only one of a class of badly-attested and incredible facts which people were quite in the habit of believing in those times, how came it to be singled out by destiny to have such an "immense effect," that Strauss, comparing that with the "utter baselessness of the story," could say that it "amounts to a world-wide deception"?

[1] Milton.

But what, according to Strauss, is the evidence which so "badly" attests this "incredible" fact? Even on his admission, it is the testimony of the disciples of Christ, their honest testimony, the statement of their honest conviction that they had actually seen and conversed with the risen Lord,—*i. e.*, testimony which Strauss would have believed, if the fact had not been such that no testimony could have made him believe it. But even admitting his premisses,—that the gospels are neither genuine nor trustworthy, and that their accounts of how the resurrection came to be believed in, are not in the least to be depended on,—there are certain other circumstances, beyond the bare testimony of the disciples, which require to be taken into consideration. Before entering upon this, it may be as well to put another question, namely, Why did Strauss not adopt a purely mythical hypothesis in explanation of the resurrection, represent it, that is, as a belief which originated subsequently to apostolic times? According to his own account, it was because the spread of Christianity can be explained only by this belief. In fact, the mythical hypothesis cannot explain everything. This is its fatal and damnatory weakness; for Christianity is so great, that after it has been divested of all that could by any possibility be mistaken for accretions, it still remains divine. We may well believe, however, that but for the testimony of Paul in an epistle whose genuineness has never been questioned, Strauss would have dated the origin of the belief in the resurrection much later than he has been compelled to do. He would, without doubt, have found for it such a date as would have got quit of all awkward questions regarding the tomb of Jesus, the possibility of His enemies producing His body; that is to say, he would have explained it as a myth, though of very early origin. The fact that in this case he would have been so utterly wrong, is sufficient to invalidate the whole mythical hypothesis, if it were not already invalidated by the fact, that Paul and the other apostles not only preached the doctrine of the resurrection, or the doctrine that Jesus was the Messiah, but the doctrine that He was the Son of God—the Son of God not in a limited official sense, not in the Jewish theocratic sense, but the "Son of God with power," the only Son of that "God who," in the words of Paul, "made the world, and all things therein," who is "Lord of heaven and earth," who

"dwelleth not in temples made with hands," in "whom all men live, and move, and have their being," and who "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." It is not necessary here to touch on the question of Unitarianism. It is sufficient for the present purpose to mention three points. 1st. That Strauss, in his *New Life of Jesus*, after in his usual way balancing probabilities, inclines to believe that "Jesus declared Himself to be the Being who should come with the clouds of Heaven, in the company of angels, in order to waken the dead and hold judgment," and admits that He so "put Himself above every one else as to contrast Himself with them as their future judge." 2d. That the passage, 1st Cor. viii. 6, which Strauss does not regard as conclusive proof that Paul attributed to Jesus a part in the creation of the world (the metaphysical idea of the Son of God as the divine logos and creator of the world being, according to Strauss, of later origin), at least shews that Paul regarded Him as above all others, and as alone sharing in the worship rendered to the God "in whom all live, and move, and have their being." And, 3d. That in the Romans Paul says of Jesus, "God sent His *only Son* in the likeness of sinful flesh." Now it must be remembered that though Paul never had intercourse with Jesus on earth, he must have seen Him, and had abundant materials for forming an opinion on His claims to be divine; and that the other apostles had had with Him a long and intimate acquaintance. This, then, was what they believed Him to be; and if His resurrection was an imagination of their own, what an impression He must have produced upon them, not only by His teaching, but by His *miracles*, if not seven weeks after His death they could honestly conclude that He was, in whatever sense we understand the words, the *only Son of God*, the Saviour of the world, who had gone to "reign at God's right hand," "till all things were put under His feet"! In view of these considerations, surely the mythical hypothesis of Strauss is a superfluity.

Leaving preliminaries, we come now to consider the circumstances which have a bearing on the testimony of the disciples to the resurrection. Space forbids us to do more than give the outlines of the argument. Strauss in his last

work passed it over, and contented himself with saying that what the disciples honestly thought to be appearances of their risen Lord, were ecstatic visions caused by a spiritual conflict, "in the endeavour to reach to light and certainty regarding their dead Master." But his views, as set forth in his *New Life of Jesus*, may be thus summed up: It is there admitted, 1st, That the legend of the burial of Jesus in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea is very old, and probably true; 2d, That it was the custom of the Romans to deliver up the dead to their friends if they demanded them; 3d, That the resurrection of Jesus was publicly announced seven weeks after His death; 4th, That the disciples thought that they not only saw Him, but held conversations with Him; 5th, That the appearances of Jesus, whether or not ecstatic visions, happened not only to single apostles, but to them all gathered together, and even to as many as five hundred at one time; 6th, That these disciples stated He had risen on the third day. On the other hand, it is affirmed: 1st, That the alleged fact is miraculous, and therefore incredible; 2d, That there is no testimony to its actual occurrence, but only to appearances, from which its occurrence is inferred; 3d, That it is at least possible that Jesus was buried in the place of criminals; 4th, That some time having elapsed before the resurrection was publicly asserted, it would be difficult to identify the buried corpse as that of Jesus; and 5th, That the Jews had a horror of dead bodies, which would prevent those of them who were enemies of Jesus from examining to see if He had risen.

Assuming, then, the standpoint of Strauss—admitting that the proofs of the resurrection are no stronger and no other than those above stated—it is evident, 1st, That even seven weeks, the period elapsing between His death and the day of Pentecost, is a very short period for the development of such a doctrine, especially when we remember that it implies such a total change in the opinions of the disciples; 2d, That the number of witnesses to the appearance of Jesus, the various circumstances in which He appeared, and the fact that the disciples thought that they not only saw Him, but conversed with Him, militates against the supposition that they were only ecstatic visions; 3d, That when Paul states it as a separate head of evidence—distinguishing it from the mere appearances to the disciples—that he had received that Christ

had risen on the third day, this, if we admit the honesty of Paul and the disciples, implies that they had something more than mere conjecture or Scripture testimony for fixing on the third day; 4th, That it is almost inconceivable that the friends of Jesus—if the Romans were in the habit of delivering up the dead when asked—would allow Him to be buried in the place of criminals, even supposing the story of Joseph of Arimathea were nothing more than a very old legend, only probably true; 5th, That if this were so, the tomb would doubtless be examined sooner or later, and even by the disciples, if they believed that Jesus had really appeared to them; 6th, That even on the supposition that Jesus was buried in the place of criminals, identification on the seventh week would not be difficult, as the spot where He was buried would be well enough known; 7th, That the enemies of Jesus, if they had a horror of dead bodies, could at least have asserted that there was no evidence in the place where He had been buried of any one having risen, and have dared His disciples to make an examination. There is, however, not the slightest trace of any attempt having been made in this way to invalidate their statements, the only means employed to check the spread of this belief being persecution.

Such is the evidence for the resurrection, even as admitted by Strauss. Baur did not venture to discuss the question, but said that it lay outside the limits of historical research; which, if it means that he himself was convinced that no resurrection ever took place, must also mean that he was unable to overthrow the evidence in its favour; that in fact, if philosophically he could not believe it, yet historically he could not refute it. From the standpoint of Rénan the evidence in its favour is so strong that, in his attempts to escape from its conclusions, he only manifests and proves its strength, by getting more inextricably entangled in its meshes. Suffice it to say that he feels compelled to admit that by the third day many of the disciples were honestly convinced that Jesus had risen from the dead that morning, and that the body, by whomsoever taken away, and wherever laid, was at least no longer in the tomb. Rénan, after admitting these premisses, makes a great many suppositions, each more improbable than the other, to escape from the legitimate conclusion of his premisses—admitting the truth of the resurrection.

Unless, therefore, we enter upon the inquiry with the foregone conclusion that it is an impossibility, the evidence in its favour is irresistible. We ask, then, How did Strauss reach this foregone conclusion? His argument, as stated in his *New Life of Jesus*, is a mere repetition of Hume's, that "even allowing the witnesses the best character, it is absolutely impossible to conceive a case in which the investigator of history will not find it more probable, beyond all comparison, that he has to deal with an untrue account rather than a miraculous account." But this improbability is stated also in stronger terms than Hume ever used, and becomes absolute impossibility—in the affirmation that a "miracle is irreconcilable with every philosophical system, whether it be Materialism, Pantheism, or Deism." This means, of course, that the possibility of a miraculous occurrence would contradict the fundamental principles of any philosophical system. What a miracle is we are not told; although what is usually meant by it is described as an "event which, inexplicable from the operation and co-operation of finite causalities, appears to be an immediate interference of the supreme infinite Cause." This definition may describe what is popularly meant by a miracle, but it certainly does not express what philosophical defenders of the miraculous usually mean by it. According to them it is not an immediate interference of the supreme infinite Cause—that is, not an interference which makes no use of finite causalities —but the manifestation of some higher law, which, if it seem to interfere with the uniformity of nature within the range of human experience, yet harmonises perfectly with the universal and eternal order. It is scarcely necessary, however, to dispute the definition given by Strauss, for in *Old Faith and the New* there is a statement which directly contradicts his former one—that a "miracle is irreconcilable with any philosophical system." There we read:

"Vainly did we philosophers and critical theologians over and over again decree the extermination of miracles. Our ineffectual sentence died away, because we could neither dispense with miraculous agency nor point to any natural force able to supply it, where it had hitherto seemed indispensable. Darwin has demonstrated this force, this process of nature; he has opened the door by which a happier coming race will cast out miracles, never to return."

This implies, that until Darwin came to his help, Strauss,

however much he might have desired it, was unable to banish miracles from his own philosophical system,—although at the very same time he was declaring that they could not be reconciled, even with "Theism appearing as a philosophy." Nay, it implies more than this. It implies that any religious theory but that of Strauss—which, whatever it is, is not Theism—requires the miraculous. "The only choice," we are told, "lies between the miracle, the divine Artificer, and Darwin." Darwinism, however, even on the admission of Strauss, has not yet been proved; and if it has not, it necessarily follows that the possibility of miracles is not overthrown,—that, in fact, "miraculous agency cannot be dispensed with."

"Even thus," so it is allowed, "the theory is unquestionably still very imperfect; it leaves an infinity of things unexplained, and, moreover, not only details, but *leading and cardinal questions;* it rather indicates possible future solutions, than gives them already itself."

Now, what does this mean, except that, for anything we know, Darwinism may turn out to have been a mistake? And if our only choice lie between Darwinism and miracles, manifestly if Darwin be mistaken, miracles are established. But what if Darwinism be proved? Would miracles therefore be cast out? Certainly not, unless Darwinism furnish an explanation of everything; and that, of course, it never can do. There will always "be more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in any philosophy." By no process of evolution—even the Evolutionists admit this—can you make a universe. Before "force" can "persist," it must first *be.* Nay, it does not seem possible that all the processes and events of that part of the universe which comes within the range of human observation, can ever be explained by evolution, simply because what we observe is only a part of an infinite whole, and because, from our finite standpoint, we can never discern all its laws,—both inasmuch as we cannot compute them all, and inasmuch as many of them must transcend our human faculties. What seem to us miracles, and apparent breaks in the uniformity of nature, are not so in reality, but only from the standpoint of human intelligence,—a *standpoint which never can be radically changed.* They prove to us, not that nature is irregular in her operations, but that, connected with the nature seen by us, there is a nature

whose workings are deeper than any human intelligence can fathom.

Darwinism thus casts out the miraculous from nature, but it places it behind nature. It says the laws of nature can all be understood by a finite intelligence; but behind all these laws, and below a uniformity without break—which can be reached by a finite intelligence—there is an absolutely inscrutable Power. To that Power some Evolutionists deny personality; others say that its personality can neither be affirmed nor denied.

Strauss belongs to the former class. In his last work, he says:

"We stand here at the limits of our knowledge; we gaze into an abyss we can fathom no further. But this much, at least, is certain, that the personal image which meets our gaze there is but a reflection of the wondering spectator himself."

But it so happens, that in his preface to the *New Life of Jesus*, he had written thus:

"Indispensable, but also imperishable, remains that part of Christianity by which it raised human nature above the sensual religion of Greece on the one hand, and Jewish legalism on the other. On one side that is, the belief that the world is governed by a spiritual and moral Power; on the other, the perception that the service of such a Being can only be like Himself,—namely, a moral and spiritual one, a worship of the disposition and heart."

Now, perhaps Strauss never strictly believed in Personality, —he was always a Pantheist. But however that may be, and whether the above passage implies Personality or not, its whole meaning is directly contradicted in his last work:

"Are we, then," it is there asked, "justified in concluding the totality of the individual existences and phenomena to be caused by a Being not in the same predicament, which has not, like these, the power of its existence in something else but in itself? This is a conclusion devoid of all coherence, of all logic. By the method of logical reasoning, we shall not get beyond the universe. If everything in the universe has been caused by something else, and so on, *ad infinitum*, what we finally reach is, not the conception of a cause, of which the cosmos is the effect, but of a *substance*, of which individual cosmical phenomena are but the accidents. We reach not a deity, but a self-centred cosmos, unchangeable amidst the eternal change of things."

With the general argument of this passage we need not concern ourselves. It is sufficient to point out that what, in the *Life* of Jesus is called a "moral and spiritual Being,"

in "The Old Faith and the New" becomes a "*substance*, of which individual cosmical phenomena are but the accidents." It will be noticed also, further on, that in the latter work a much smaller value is assigned to the good achieved by Christianity than in the passage above quoted from the "New Life."

Darwinism thus left Strauss in the possession of a Pantheism, with its outward form changed,—that is, a material, instead of a spiritual, Pantheism. But with Evolutionists generally, Pantheism is scouted, equally with Deism. Herbert Spencer declares Atheism, Pantheism, and Deism to be equally inconceivable. He differs with Strauss, therefore, in regard to the question of Personality. He says:

"Duty requires us neither to affirm nor deny Personality. Our duty is to submit ourselves with all humility to the established limits of our intelligence, and not perversely to rebel against them." [1]

John Stuart Mill held the same opinion. Writing of his father, he says:

"Finding, therefore, no halting place in Deism, he remained in a state of perplexity, until doubtless after many struggles he yielded to the conviction that, concerning the origin of things, nothing whatever can be known, for dogmatic atheism he looked upon as absurd, as most of those whom the world has considered Atheists have always done." [2]

Strauss was certainly not one of these. He was a Pantheist, but an Atheistic Pantheist; and if that be a contradictory epithet, it is so because his system is contradictory.

But how do Evolutionists reach the conclusion that, behind all phenomena there is an inscrutable Power, the personality of which can neither be affirmed nor denied? For an answer to this question, let us inquire of Herbert Spencer, the principal philosopher of the "Wes" in England. The first step in Mr Spencer's argument is a repetition of the reasoning employed by Hamilton and Mansel to establish the relativity of all knowledge:—To know the infinite, the absolute, is a contradiction, for to be an object of consciousness, to be known, is to be classed, that is conditioned. So far he agrees with Hamilton and Mansel. But he says:

"There still remains the final question. What must we say concerning that which transcends knowledge? Are we to rest wholly in the consciousness of phenomena? Is the result of inquiry to exclude utterly from our minds everything but the relative, or must we also believe in something beyond the relative?" [3]

[1] *First Principles*, p. 108. [2] *Autobiography*, p. 39. [3] First Principles, p. 87.

Hamilton's answer to this question is, that although the absolute involved a contradiction, the negation of it equally involved a contradiction, because it made it impossible to think of a relative; that as these are contradictories, one must be true; and that he had an irresistible conviction of the real existence of something unconditioned. Herbert Spencer shews, we think conclusively, the inconsistency of this reasoning. If our argument leaves us only two contradictories to believe in, the conclusion forced upon us is that both are to be rejected, and that either we have nothing left us to believe in, or our argument is at fault. From the dilemma of Hamilton he therefore seeks escape, and by the following expedient. He says:

"It is not to be denied that so long as we confine ourselves to the purely logical aspect of the question, the propositions quoted above must be accepted in their entirety; but when we contemplate its more general or psychological aspect, we find that these propositions are imperfect statements of the truth, omitting or rather excluding, as they do, an all-important fact. To speak specifically, besides that *definite* consciousness of which logic formulates the laws, there is also an *indefinite* consciousness which cannot be formulated. Besides complete thoughts, and besides the thoughts which, though incomplete, admit of completion, there are thoughts which it is impossible to complete; and yet which are still real in the sense that they are normal affections of the intellect" (p. 88). "The absolute, then, is present as an incomplete thought. We have an indefinite consciousness of it." "To say that we cannot *know* the absolute, is by implication to affirm *that there is* an absolute" (p. 88).

This reasoning, however, seems to involve the fallacy of a consciousness *absolutely* indefinite, which of course is a negation of consciousness; the fallacy of a thought which it is not only impossible to complete, but towards the completion of which not one step has been taken, and which therefore has no existence. This difficulty Mr Spencer recognises, and endeavours to obviate in the following manner:

"Such consciousness is not and cannot be constituted by any single mental act; but is the product of many mental acts. In each concept there is an element that persists. It is alike impossible for this element to be absent from consciousness, and for it to be present in consciousness alone; either alternative involves unconsciousness—the one from the want of the substance, the other from the want of the form. But the persistence of this element under successive conditions necessitates a sense of it as distinguished from the conditions, and independent of them. The sense of a something that is conditioned in every thought cannot be got rid of, because the something cannot be got rid of. How, then, must the sense

of this something be constituted? Evidently by combining successive concepts deprived of their limits and conditions. We form this indefinite thought as we form many of our definite thoughts by the coalescence of a series of thoughts" (p. 94). "This consciousness is not the abstract of any group of thoughts, ideas, or conceptions; but it is the abstract of all thoughts, ideas, or conceptions" (p. 95).

This reasoning shews masterly ingenuity; but, nevertheless, seems to involve quite a cluster of fallacies. 1st. If an element be introduced into consciousness, it must in some degree be known, it must produce some effect in consciousness, and an effect cannot be *absolutely* indefinite. 2d. "Concepts deprived of their limits and conditions" cannot be "combined," for *before* you have combined them you have annihilated them. Let us take the example given by Mr Spencer:

"On thinking," he says, "of a piano, there first rises in imagination its visual appearance, to which are instantly added (though by separate mental acts) the ideas of its remote side and of its solid substance. A complete conception, however, involves the strings, the hammers, the dampers, the pedals; and while successively adding these to the conception, the attributes first thought of lapse more or less completely out of consciousness. Nevertheless the whole group constitutes a representation of the piano. Now, as in this case, we form a definite concept of a special existence, by imposing limits and conditions in successive acts; so, in the converse case, by taking the limits and conditions in successive acts, we form an indefinite notion of general existence" (p. 95).

No.—If we take away all limits and conditions from the piano, we leave nothing, we annihilate the piano—we do not annihilate the universe, but we leave nothing where the piano stood. For it was not the case in regard to the piano that we formed a definite concept of a special existence *only* by imposing limits and conditions in successive acts; we had its "visual appearance" to begin with, and that could not have been absolutely general—*i. e.* if it had not been of some colour we would not have seen it.[1] 3d. To "distinguish" an "element under successive conditions" from the "conditions" implies comparison; and this, according to Spencer, Hamilton, and Mansel, is impossible in regard to the absolute. 4th. Before we can have a series of thoughts, we must have one thought.

[1] Mr Spencer makes the mistake of confounding *absolute* with *general* existence. The indefinite notion we have of general existence—*e. g.* the case of the piano—is not an indefinite notion of *absolute* but of *relative* existence, that is, of existence in some form, but a form not yet clearly and fully discerned; and if we did get the notion of absolute existence from combining these indefinite conceptions of relative existence, we would simply be deluding ourselves.

But we cannot think without, according to Mr Spencer, an indefinite consciousness of the absolute. It is implied in the very first act of thinking, and therefore cannot be a consciousness acquired by successive acts of thinking. 5th. The absolute cannot be suggested as the "abstract of *all* the thoughts, ideas, or conceptions" of any *individual* or number of individuals, unless these thoughts be *infinite in number*. 6th. An *absolutely "indefinite notion"* cannot be *"formed"* by any process. If it be formed, if it be in any sense (*i. e.* any logical sense) a "notion," it cannot be absolutely indefinite. 7th. To say that the real is merely the persistent in consciousness, is to lapse into what Mr Spencer himself calls "the insanities of idealism." If the real, the absolute, be nothing more than this, it must depend on our individual existence which is a contradiction. If it be more than this, we must have some reason besides this to predicate its reality. Mr Spencer's theory seems therefore encompassed with greater difficulties than even that of Hamilton and Mansel.

We are thus forced to conclude that the idea of the absolute cannot be acquired, cannot be produced merely from without, cannot be formed by successive mental acts; that it must always be present in the mind, latent there, but shadowed forth to us even in the relative, and known by us, though necessarily by a higher than merely logical knowledge. Herbert Spencer seems to believe in the absolute without a shadow of evidence to justify his belief. Hamilton believed in it, though it was to him a contradiction, because he could not help it. The faith of Spencer is one altogether without knowledge. The faith of Hamilton and Mansel is one not merely beyond and without knowledge, but which contradicts it; inasmuch as all knowledge to them is logical knowledge,—even the highest truth that can be known, truth which can be put into logical forms. But if we assign to *reason* the same function as is assigned by Hamilton to *faith*, we have no contradiction; for this is but to say that the logical, the argumentative, faculty of man, is only a part of his mind: not, indeed, even in itself contradictory to any other part, but liable to error, or at least to partial views of truth, unless supplemented by means of his higher faculties. Looking at truth only, as expressed in logical forms, we see it only in its finite, material aspect; looking at truth through the emotions and by the aid of latent

innate ideas of the true, the beautiful, and the good, we discern its infinite and eternal aspect. Both, however, are aspects of *truth*, and the finite therefore suggests the infinite; but if, as is done by Hamilton and Mansel's philosophy, we make the one aspect alone an object of knowledge, and the other wholly an object of faith, we obtain nothing but two contradictories, which we are enabled to harmonise and believe in only by the aid of a faith altogether blind. Perhaps the German words, *Vernunft* (reason), and *Verstand* (understanding), are those which best denote the two faculties now insisted on. We may know through our reason what we cannot understand by our logical faculties or think of in a logical form; what we cannot express in logical propositions or even in words. The highest thought, the deepest feeling, is unutterable; the verses of an inspired poet only shadow it forth and suggest it; it is breathed out in music, or written for us in the sublime but untranslatable language of outward nature. Not the less, however, is it impossible that infinite truth, perfect goodness, consummate beauty, can either have no connection with, or absolutely contradict our conceptions of truth, beauty, and goodness. No poet has the license to transgress certain known laws of metre and rhythm, or to violate logical thinking. Poetry is more than correspondence with these, but it *does* correspond with them. The sublimest music agrees with recognised principles of harmony. And the beautiful in nature harmonises with certain faculties within us. Poetry, music, the beautiful in nature, are more than all these laws, but they agree with them. In like manner religion is more than theology, more than certain logical propositions, but it must include and harmonise with some kind of theology expressed or unexpressed. Theology is only one aspect of truth, but it is an aspect. It must in some degree be possible, or religion would be impossible. Religious knowledge, in the strictest sense, is the "knowledge of faith," but not of a blind faith—not of a faith which contradicts our logical faculties, but which transcends them.

What, therefore, is here contended for is, that there is in man a faculty which *knows* in some degree the absolute, and because it does so, connects him with God. The bearing of this on the personality of God is very evident. Mansel considers it "his duty to think of God as personal, and to believe that He is infinite;" although, in his opinion, personality contradicts

infinitude. Herbert Spencer considers "it his duty neither to affirm nor deny personality," and therefore thinks of God as an "absolutely inscrutable Power." That, however, also involves a contradiction, for, as we have seen, even to predicate existence implies knowledge, and, if to know is to limit, then to attribute existence to the absolute is to limit it.[1] We cannot speak of an absolutely inscrutable *Power*, but only of an absolutely inscrutable ———. If we use the word power, we must attach some meaning to it, however vague; but this is inconsistent with the power being absolutely inscrutable. We cannot speak of "phenomena" being "*manifestations* of the absolutely Unknowable," for the absolutely Unknowable "can manifest" nothing. Mr Spencer concedes permission (or rather admits that he himself requires) to "give shape to that indefinite sense of an ultimate existence which forms the basis of our intelligence," "to represent it to ourselves in *some* form of thought, however vague;"[2] but how can this be a privilege or a necessity, if every attempt at thought be either suicidal of itself, or absolutely without any meaning at all. "We shall not err," he says, "in doing this, so long as we treat every notion we thus frame as merely a symbol, utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands." Can there be a symbol *utterly* without resemblance to that for which it stands? Could it be framed if we were to treat it as utterly without resemblance? And if it could, would there be any advantage in doing it?

The absolute, therefore, although altogether unknowable in a logical form, must be *known* by a faculty which transcends the mere understanding, if it is to be *believed* in. That "unknown reality which," Mr Spencer says, "underlies both spirit and matter," and which is neither, can have no existence. We must either be Materialists, Spiritualists, or Nihilists. But it is our spirit that connects us with the absolute; it is through it that we know it, and therefore we are shut up to believe that the absolutely real is spirit. If it be said that we are finite persons, and that personality limits, the answer to this is, that it is only our logical faculty that limits, and that

[1] If, according to Mr Spencer, we know existence only as relative, to attribute existence to the absolute is to change it into the relative. What is meant by the absolute *existing*?

[2] *First Principles*, p. 113.

our personality is greater than our logical faculty. To say that we can "neither attribute nor deny personality" to God, is to admit that to speak of an infinite person is not, at least, a contradiction. An infinite person is as conceivable as an infinite thing. The depths of personality even Mr Spencer admits that he cannot fathom; and it necessarily follows, that although we are finite persons, there may be an infinite Person. We have therefore forced upon us that "conviction," which Dr Hutchison Sterling says that Hegel (although Strauss and many belonging to his theological school regard him as their philosophical father) made "clearer and firmer" to him,—the "conviction of an infinite principle in this universe," the "conviction of this principle being thought, spirit," and the "conviction that man partakes of this infinite principle, and that consequently he is immortal, free, and in communion with God."

The *immortality of the soul* is involved in the question of God's personality. Denying the possibility of the miraculous in nature; denying that there can be anything which, to a finite intelligence, must always appear as a break in outward uniformity, and denying the personality of God, Strauss also denies man's immortality, and in this he is perfectly consistent. We find also that those Evolutionists who think of God as an absolutely inscrutable Power, to which we can neither attribute nor deny personality, make the question of man's immortality one regarding which nothing whatever can be known. In this they also are consistent with themselves, though they disagree with Strauss. Mr Mill regarded the immortality of man as not impossible, but he did not say that it was even in the smallest degree probable. Darwinists, however, generally avoid the subject, or simply affirm that there is nothing in their doctrines irreconcileable with man's immortality. Strauss was neither so reticent nor so diffident:

"We have learnt," he says, "from closer observation in the domain of physiology and psychology, that the body and soul, even if we venture to distinguish them as two separate essences, are nevertheless so nearly united, the so-called soul so entirely conditioned by the nature and circumstances of its material organ, the brain, that its continuance is unimaginable without it. . . . But a thing so intimately and completely bound to a physical organism, can as little exist after the latter's destruction as the centre of a circle after the dissolution of its circumference."

Here Strauss speaks of soul and body as if he thoroughly understood everything about them,—almost, indeed, as if it were possible, by chemical combinations, to manufacture a living soul. Herbert Spencer's whole philosophy, on the other hand, is based upon the recognition of an absolutely inscrutable power both in man and nature. He says:

"The personality of which each is conscious, and of which the existence is to each a fact beyond all others the most certain, is yet a thing which cannot truly be known at all,—knowledge of it is forbidden by the very nature of thought."[1]

Strauss had penetrated this mystery of the *Ego*, at least so far as to enable him to reach the assurance that that personality, which to Mr Spencer is utterly inscrutable, would be broken up, dissipated, and dissolved into nothingness at death. In this, however, as in other things, he went beyond the legitimate principles of Darwinism. Granted, for argument's sake, that man is developed by imperceptible degrees from the lower animals, and even ultimately from inorganic matter, it may nevertheless be true that all those lower forms of life were but, so to speak, the attempts of nature to form a life that should live for ever, which attempt, from the fact that man has reached to the conception of immortality, we may conclude to have been successful when development attained to his formation; and his death we may conceive to be the triumph of the soul, or of that mysterious, inscrutable power, which, according to some philosophers, is neither spirit nor matter, over the material principles in which it is imbedded; the casting off of the outward shell which confines it to the world of phenomena, and its escape to that eternal life, and to that world of reality which, to the same philosophers, is utterly inscrutable.

There is thus a side of Darwinism which seems even to favour the doctrine of immortality; but the general tendency of its principles must, notwithstanding, inevitably be to discredit that doctrine. A thing utterly inscrutable is really nothing, and soon comes to be practically regarded as such. It must also be added, that although Evolutionists repel as unjust and absurd the charge of materialism, and tell us that the "materialist and spiritualist controversy is a mere war of words," because the ultimate cause is an absolutely unknown

[1] *First Principles*, p. 66.

power, as much spirit as matter, but neither the one nor the other, there is nevertheless something suspicious in the methods of inquiry they employ. Chemical experiments, dissection of animal structures, comparison of bones and tissues, calculation of mechanical forces, exploration of geological strata, however advantageous and essential they may be as part of our evidence regarding the nature of things, are applicable only to material things. To rely on them alone, or chiefly, is certainly, to say the least, to allow the material part of the question unduly to preponderate. Hence, naturally, the impression is produced, that in man the material part is all and in all, and that even living matter is not very different from dead matter,—the former having only, by a gradual process called the "persistence of force," become endowed for a certain number of years with the power to separate itself from the other matter of the universe, to attract to itself and absorb a certain portion of that matter by a curious motion called digestion, to employ and expend it in the simpler motion of walking, and other mechanical movements, and in the very complex motions of thinking, feeling, and loving; till, after a certain period its power of individual motion, like that of a clock unwound, ceases, its energy is all expended, it becomes dead, that is, inorganic like other matter.

Strauss then, denying man's immortality, found it necessary to go another step, and to affirm that immortality was not a thing to be desired by man, even if it were within his reach:

"He who," so we read in *Old Faith and the New*, "does not inflate himself, is well aware of the humble measure of his capacities, and while grateful for the time allowed him for their development, makes no claim for its prolongation beyond the duration of his earthly life; nay, its eternal existence would fill him with dismay."

It is certainly difficult to understand why, if life here be so pleasant as to make us grateful, the idea of its prolongation beyond its earthly limits should only fill us with dismay. But this being Strauss' feeling, he regarded Christianity, which had, through the resurrection of Jesus, changed the idea of immortality from one of vague hope to one of assured conviction, and whose predominance in the world is wholly due to this, as exercising an influence not only delusive, but in the highest degree pernicious. In his last work, indeed, his antipathy to it was more out-spoken than in any previous

one, and his estimate of Jesus much lower than it seemed to be in his *New Life*. In his first *Life*, he left the existence of Jesus a matter of doubt,—at least, he did not affirm it in so many words. In his *New Life*, his estimate of Him is somewhat variable; but in one place he admits that

"He introduced features into the idea of humanity which were wanting in it before, or had continued undeveloped; reduced the dimensions of others, which prevented its universal application; imparted into it, by the religious aspect which He gave it, a more lofty consecration, and bestowed upon it, by embodying it in His own person, the most vital warmth; while the religious society which took its rise from Him, provided for this ideal the widest acceptance among mankind."

A passage has been also quoted already, in which he speaks of an "indispensable and imperishable element in Christianity." In his last work, however, he declared, regarding those precepts which are the "fairest attribute" of Christianity, that it "neither introduced them to the world, nor will they disappear from the world along with it."

"Jesus, as the religious leader, must," we are told, "come to be daily more and more estranged from mankind, as the latter has developed under the influence of the civilising powers of modern times." And again: "If we open our eyes, and are honest enough to avow what they shew us, we must acknowledge that the entire activity and aspiration of the civilised nations of our time is based on views of life which run *directly counter* to those of Christ."

The belief in immortality completely neutralised, according to Strauss, the good effected by the moral principles of Christianity; and these principles neither belonged to it alone, nor in a degree never possessed by other systems. In the long-run, therefore, its influence has been evil, and not good. Its fundamental and peculiar doctrines are the very antipodes of those of Strauss. We may in substance express the difference thus—Christianity proclaims that the last enemy to be destroyed is death, Strauss, that man's last and only enemy is belief in his own immortality. There are scarcely any Evolutionists, however, who, like Strauss, regard the belief in immortality as one wholly pernicious. Leslie Stephen, in a book entitled *Free Thinking and Plain Speaking*, which is a reproduction, with slight modifications and a few new applications, of the views set forth by

Strauss in *Old Faith and the New*, says that the belief in immortality

"is valuable, in so far as it has enabled men to rise above the selfishness and sensuality which otherwise threatened to choke the higher impulses of our nature" (p. 106). He adds also that "It was the existence of those impulses which gave it its strength, and not any of the metaphysical arguments, which can only appeal to a very few exceptional minds."

Thus, what Strauss regards as having been all along a powerful check on human progress, and as having narrowed, and almost neutralised the good that belonged to Christianity, Mr Stephen regards as the necessary result of the moral power of the principles promulgated by Christ, as having originated "in the highest impulses of our nature," and as having been in the past the only influence which "has enabled men to rise above selfishness and sensuality."

Mr Stephen, however, agrees with Strauss that the belief in immortality had likewise a pernicious influence. It saved from great evils, but it was by entailing evils only less great. It created an ascetic element, and that element, according to Mr Stephen, is an essential element of Christianity. In his opinion, Christians were a kind of Socialists, who

"renounced the world as a scene of brutal tyranny, but looked for safety to passive submission instead of active revolt. They accepted poverty and suffering as inevitable, and sought for refuge in the hopes of another world, or of a millennium to be brought about by miraculous agencies" (p. 146). "To them the present world appears to be a scene of misery; its pleasures are empty delusions; to partake of them is to run the risk of sullying our souls, and he is best who yields least to the temptations of the senses" (p. 140).

Mr Stephen denies the right of any who do not hold these views, in the extreme form now stated, to call themselves Christians. A belief in immortality of such a kind as not to produce strict asceticism, according to him, either does not exist, or is so indefinite and feeble a thing, as not to be worthy of the name of belief. Strauss also regarded Christianity as a pessimist religion so far as this world is concerned, but with a complement to its pessimism in the glory of the heavenly kingdom which was believed to be near at hand. He regarded it as, on that account, entirely opposed to the spirit of modern times, entirely unsuited for modern necessities. He objected to it with Buckle, that it does not encourage the love of

money; agreed with Rènan in regretting that in the beatitudes no reward is promised to military valour, and with John Stuart Mill condemned it, because it makes no mention of patriotism, and does not instruct men in the duties of citizenship.

This erroneous conception of Christianity seems to have two sources. 1st. Not only does it forget that asceticism was not universally practised among the early Christians, but it takes for granted that Christianity, in all the fulness of its meaning, in all the breadth of its principles, was understood by them. It forgets that a man,—if we may speak in this way of Jesus,—truly great, must be beyond the full comprehension of his own generation; that thoughts which are destined to have a lasting influence in the world do not manifest all their greatness to the age which first hears them spoken, and very often at first exercise only the prejudicial effects of half-truths; that the real character of their influence is not fully known until society in its manifold relations be permeated by them; that the seeds sown must be rooted deeply in bygone centuries, have absorbed for a long time the properties of the soil in which they grow, be tried and firmed by exposure to tempests of contrary opinion, and have long experience of the influences both of storm and sunshine, before they attain to full strength and beauty. It allows nothing for narrowness of apprehension, for previous ignorance, for other surrounding influences, for ideas engendered by adversity and persecution, and for views of life produced by revolt from the multiform wickedness then existing in the world. At that time society, Jewish, Roman, Grecian, was corrupted through and through. "The whole world was lying in wickedness." To love the world was to be corrupted. Granted also that the annals of Christianity have often been stained by deeds of great cruelty, that for a long time it outrageously violated the principles of charity, and that its toleration did not "rise above crusades and the persecution of heretics." Yet, remember what it was that preceded Christianity, remember how slowly new truths have been absorbed into the life of the world, and that the teaching of Christ and the apostles was the first to promulgate, with a justness of conception never afterwards surpassed, those very principles which are used to judge and condemn it; and do not lay the blame on Christianity, but on human nature.

2d. Those erroneous views of Christianity originate in a misconception of the true nature and use of moral principles. Christianity tells men to be diligent in business, and if it does not encourage the love of money, it is because that passion needs no encouragement. It tells men to be of good courage, to "fight the good fight of faith," and if it promises no special rewards to *military* valour, it is because it is a gospel of love. If it says nothing about patriotism in the usual acceptation of the term, it is because it gives a wider and nobler meaning to the idea it contains, by announcing that "God hath made of one blood all nations for to dwell on the face of the earth." If it gives no instruction in the special duties of citizenship, it at least inculcates those moral virtues which are the true glory of nations and individuals, the only guarantee for the proper performance of the duties of citizenship, and the only foundation of lasting national prosperity. To the objection, that it is impossible in our days to believe thoroughly in immortality, and yet do our duty here, a better answer could not be given than is contained in the words of the late Mr Robertson of Brighton, which in the very smallest compass, and in a way as convincing as it is beautiful, set before us the very essence of a Christian life, depicting both its true glory as manifested in Christ, and demonstrating its necessity and fitness for our own and for all times. The ideal they set before us is one of which every Christian comes far short, but not less is it the ideal of Christianity:

"To shroud ourselves in no false mist of holiness; to dare to shew ourselves as we are, making no solemn affectation of reserve or difference from others; to be found at the marriage-feast; to accept the invitation of the rich Pharisee, Simon, and the scorned publican, Zaccheus; to mix with the crowd of men, using no affected singularity, content to be 'creatures not too bright or good for human nature's daily food:' and yet for a man amidst it all to remain a consecrated spirit, his trials and his solitariness known only to his Father—a being set apart, not *of* this world, alone in the heart's deeps with God; to put the cup of this world's gladness to his lips, and yet be unintoxicated; to gaze steadily on all its grandeur, and yet be undazzled, plain and simple in personal desires; to feel its brightness, and yet defy its thrall—this is the difficult, and rare, and glorious life of God in the soul of man. This, this was the peculiar glory of the life of Christ, which was manifested in the first miracle which Jesus wrought at the marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee."[1]

[1] *Sermons.* Second Series. Sermon xix.

On the other hand, What is the peculiar advantage of not believing in immortality? On this point it cannot be said that the representatives of modern "enlightenment" are perfectly agreed with one another, or with themselves individually. Mr Stephen's opinions, for example, veer about in all directions, and he is continually (of course unconsciously) either contradicting, or half-contradicting, or modifying, or retracting in one place what he had said in another. He tells us at one time that few people now believe in immortality, and if some have a vague hope regarding it, the hope is so slight and feeble as to exert no practical influence whatever; in fact it is little better than make believe. Then he says: "It is easy to maintain that it (*i. e.* this vague hope) is necessary to balance the materalizing influences of the time" (p. 147); influences, besides, which have grown beyond the need of this belief. In another place again, he says of this sham belief:

> "We cannot in obedience to science quench
>
> 'Those *obstinate* questionings
> Of sense and outward things,'—
>
> which still perplex the world's old age as they brightened its infancy. The 'light of common day' is too blank and dreary to satisfy our souls" (p. 138).

But this "blank and dreary" outlook becomes subsequently the only one worthy to engage our interest; and he bids us, as if his bidding were enough, "no longer fix our minds on a chimera, but on tangible and reliable prospects" (p. 356). Yet, once more, he speaks of "this *clinging* to another life," and explains that the "real meaning" of it is, "simply an expression of the reluctance of the human being to use the awful word 'never'" (p. 342); as if, although the word be "awful," we ought to have no reluctance to use it. Then he forgets that there is anything "awful" in the matter, for in preaching to us the new gospel of submission to the inevitable, he tells us that in doing so,—in using the word "never,"—"we have the best security for happiness" (p. 357); but this is seemingly not a very good security, since he speaks of this world and its arrangements as "a sorry scheme of things," which he cannot believe is "the work of Omnipotence guided by infinite benevolence" (p. 334). Apparently, however, his doctrine of submission to the inevitable, with its best "security for happi-

ness," is either only hypothesis, or all a mistake; for, before proclaiming it, he wrote thus:

"We may be certain, that if the various tendencies which we have summed up in the name of Darwinism, should ultimately become triumphant, they must find some means—*though it is given to nobody as yet to define them*—of reconciling those instincts of which the belief in immortality was a product" (p. 109).

Mr Stephen thus, in his views, oscillates between Optimism and Pessimism. Strauss was an Optimist. He declared this world, as it is, to be very good; and he demanded the same piety for his Cosmos as the devout of old demanded for their God. Evolutionists generally we may class as Optimists; since, if the universe correspond with their pet theory, they can surely find no fault with it. Mr Mill, again, was more a Pessimist than an Optimist, and "could not find absolute goodness in the Author of a world so corroded with suffering and deformed by injustice as ours,"[1] although he himself, born into this world, and made out of its dust, could form to himself "the conception of a Perfect Being, to which he could eventually refer as the Guide of his conscience,"—a Perfect Being much nobler than the Author of this world (if it had an Author), and by whose imaginary aid he could weigh the universe in the balances, and find it wanting. With Mr Mill immortality was an open question; but it is probable that it was the doubts he felt regarding it which tinged with so much sadness his views of the present world.

How, then, do Mill, Strauss, and those who have no belief in immortality, form their conception of present duty? There is, we are told, a real immortality, though not an immortality in heaven: if not an earthly, at least a material or scientific immortality; an immortality, if not of endless progress, at least of endless "evolution and dissolution;" and if not for us individually, at least in some way or other for the work we do here:

"Why," says John Morley, in a notice of Mr Mill, "do you not recognise the loftiness and spirituality of those who make their heaven in the thought of the wider light and purer happiness that, in the immensity of ages, may be brought to new generations of men by long force of vision and endeavour? What great element is wanting in the life guided by such a hope?"

To this the answer is, that the hope, however noble and

[1] *Autobiography*, p. 46.

spiritual, is, according to their own statement of the case, utterly delusive; delusive, surely, if this world be so essentially "corroded with suffering and deformed by injustice," as Mill declared it to be; delusive, surely, if men of science be right in their anticipations regarding the final destiny of this planet, —if, as Strauss says, "a time must come when all that which, in the course of her development, was produced, and in a manner accomplished by her,—all living and rational beings, and all their productions, all political organisations, all works of art and science, will not only have necessarily vanished from existence, without a trace, but even the memory of them will survive in no mind, as the history of the earth must necessarily perish with her;" delusive, if, as we are again told, "the all be in no succeeding moment more perfect than in the preceding one, or *vice versâ*," and progress be nothing but endless "evolution and dissolution;" delusive, because the welfare of beings whose lives are so paltry, uncertain, and fleeting as this earthly existence of ours, cannot appear a great and glorious thing by the mere accumulation, through long succession, of their petty individualities.

Mr Stephen again tells us that "the best wisdom of life is the acceptance of accomplished facts" (p. 342), and that "the love of those we have lost may enable us to love better those who remain, and those who are to come" (p. 348). Should it not rather have the very opposite effect? If we would save ourselves vain and bitter sorrow, if we would love "wisely," we must, having regard to the "awful" word "never," take care not "to love too well," both for our own sakes, and the sake of others. The ties of friendship cannot but be regarded as slender, if we consider them to be utterly and irrevocably broken by death. Surely, at any rate, the belief in immortality should not hinder or quench our love for others, but rather ennoble all earthly friendship by imparting to it, not a temporal and fleeting, but an eternal character. There is, we are told, a blessedness in sorrow, a blessedness in earnest work, a blessedness in regarding the good of others, a blessedness which is better than happiness; but there can surely be no blessedness in delusion—and life is a delusion, friendship is a delusion, work is a delusion, the future of the human race is a delusion, if death be the "final goal" of all.

"Our own dim lives should teach us this,
That life shall live for evermore,
Else earth is darkness at the core,
And dust and ashes all that is."

What does it matter how any man, or any number or succession of men, live their short lives here, if all is to end in the grave? What matters the future history of the world? What human progress? What the civilization we are assisting to advance, if it be only the history, the progress, the civilization of beings who perish for ever, one by one, through endless ages, which "bring to life" only to "bring to death"?

"What, then, were God to such as I?
'T were hardly worth my while to choose
Of things all mortal, or to use
A little patience ere I die.

"'T were best at once to sink to peace;
Like birds the charming serpent draws,
To drop head foremost in the jaws
Of vacant darkness, and to cease."

To the taunt of selfishness the reply is, that it is only selfish to seek for an immortality of evil; that, if to desire what is truly good here be not selfish, no more is it selfish to desire what is eternally good. The diligence, noble unselfishness, and devotion to the world's good which characterized the life of Mill are worthy of all honour, but how many of the principles which guided it were borrowed unconsciously from Christianity? It is impossible, indeed, that the school of thought, which ignores the immortality of the soul, could get men generally to interest themselves about the future of the world and of the human race, if the idea of God and a future world were banished wholly from their thoughts, and if the light of immortality—which through Christ's resurrection has been for eighteen centuries in reality the star of man's highest hope and endeavour, the "master light of all his seeing"—were quenched in utter darkness. Let that light be extinguished utterly and for ever, so that it shall not exercise even the influence of a perhaps, so that it shall not even exist as the memory of a dead hope; let it become engrained in human thought that this short life is all; and it will be vain to look to the so-called immortality of human progress, made up

of short and trivial individual thought and endeavour, trivial joy and sorrow, to lend dignity to present occupations, and to convince men that "they are not like the beasts that perish," and that they "should abide in honour."

T. F. HENDERSON.

---

## ART. V.—*William Carstares.*

TO most to whom the names of the saints and fathers of the Scottish Church are familiar, and whose copies of the *Scots Worthies* and *Cloud of Witnesses* have been well and lovingly thumbed, the name of the man which heads this paper will probably be unknown; yet he was a father of the Scottish Church, if ever any one was, and is worthier of a place in her Hagiology than many who are there. The visitor to Edinburgh who is curious about Revolution-history matters will neither see nor hear anything to recall him as a man who filled a foremost place among his contemporaries, and powerfully influenced the destinies of his country. In that sacred place of burial where he was laid, the famous Greyfriars' churchyard, whose air is full of imperishable historic associations, you will seek well nigh in vain for his name. His monument indeed is there, next to Henderson's,[1] but is weather-worn and hardly distinguishable. Yet he was as wise, and true, and brave a son of the Church of Scotland as her great leader in her conflict with Charles and Laud, and although unknown in her hagiologies, he has been called, with much historic fitness, her "second Founder."[2]

But although this proud title may be one open to question, and may even be an undeserved one, yet this much is perfectly certain, that William Carstares was no common man, and was one of our greatest Churchmen; and it is just possible that for a hundred and fifty years we have all been forgetting the name of one of Scotland's genuine worthies. Ah, those forgotten worthies! We enter into their labours, we delight ourselves beside the still waters and green pastures won by their patience, their hope, and their bravery, and do them, too

[1] Stanley, *Lectures on the Church of Scotland*, says, "The grave is unmarked by any *monument*" (p. 122).

[2] Ibid. p. 121.

often, no homage in our hearts,—sometimes not even knowing, or, what is worse and altogether inexcusable, not even caring about their names. What though the better sort of them were men who cared for none of our praise? The loyal servants of duty, who could not render her enough of sturdy service, and sought only the smile of their own conscience, and found that enough to cheer them in the breach, in the desert, and in the prison, let us none the less know them by name, and cherish their memories. They have lived for us; have influenced our destinies, have made us their debtors. They, of all men, should not be forgotten. Happily for their good name, and for us and our children, they are not likely to be. It is one of the best fruits of the historical spirit of our time, to which the archives and charter-chests of our chief public and private libraries are now open, that justice is likely to be meted out alike to all who have figured, or are supposed to have figured, in the past. There will be, one may be sure, some significant reversals of popular verdicts. It will stand hard, for instance, with many of the old favourites of Party. No matter. Others, whose names have been in few mouths, or who fell on 'evil days,' but whose ideas have since borne fruit, or whose work still stands firm, will come conspicuously to the front; and this will be as it should. We shall find that, after all, History is but another name for Justice, whose eternal maxim is those sacred and irreversible words, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Will William Carstares bear this judgment? This question may be answered satisfactorily by every one who cares to do it. The facts of his life are many, characteristic, and well authenticated. His *State Papers*, edited by M'Cormick, is not a scarce book. Macaulay, Burton, Cunningham, Grub, and Stanley, have each paid him their tribute. These have been just supplemented by a careful and excellently written historical biography from the pen of Mr Story of Roseneath, in which Carstares and his time are clearly, although at too great length, set before us.[1] In circumstances so favourable for forming a just and definite opinion on one of our greatest Churchmen, and in the belief that there is very much need for this, I propose to put before our readers in the following

[1] *William Carstares: A Character and Career of the Revolutionary Epoch*, 1649—1715. London: M'Millan & Co. 1874.

pages, the chief facts of Carstares' "career," that they may be able for themselves to see what was his "character." In the course of this they ought to see what was the actual worth of the man, and discover the reasons why he never was canonised.

His life, like the lives of many in his troubled time, was full of strange, often stirring, incidents, most of which are characteristic of the man or of his times, and is divided into three distinct periods.

The first period embraces the years when he was a political conspirator; the second period, when he was King William's favourite chaplain and confidential secretary on Scotch affairs; the third period, when he was Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and leader of the Church of Scotland.

He first saw the light on the 11th of February 1649, at Cathcart, a sunny, agricultural parish, a little south of Glasgow, of which his father, John Carstares, "a man of no small mark among the Scottish Churchmen of the days of the Commonwealth and persecution," was the minister. His father was one whose life we cannot closely scan without getting a glimpse into the inner spirit of those times: what was best in them and most heroic, he had a large share of, and was not wanting in their intolerances. Every inch a Covenanter, a thorough upholder of Christ's crown and covenant, he was one of the ministers who thronged the Scottish camp at Dunbar, provokingly profuse of advice, which ended in headlong disaster, and was one of those who railed at the great Oliver to his face in the Cathedral of Glasgow, whither he had now been removed. We are all familiar with Knox's fearless, or, as they may happen to be called, his fierce and insolent, reprimands: both Painting and Poetry have made them their own. Yet what a striking, and in its way suggestive, picture is it to see those stern, uncompromising Presbyters denouncing the not less stern but more reasonable Puritan, who had come to deliver them from their bondage of delusion!

This "extreme contentiousness of spirit," as Mr Story remarks, was in nowise incompatible with "profound personal piety." Of course it was not. The stern realism of those days made it not only possible, but inevitable. We smile complacently, or we have our scoff, at the solemn importance put upon trifles by the Covenanters, and we frequently call

them "enthusiasts" and "fanatics." That is easy to do. But we must not pretend to any proper historical understanding of them and their work, if we do this. Any one can cavil and find fault, and so pretend to a monopoly of wisdom: the very rare thing is the judicial, historical spirit, which at once understands and fairly measures out praise and blame. No men have suffered more from a want of this spirit than the Covenanters, especially as they are seen during those years when they were rent into sections, and were, on the one hand, at the mercy of a Court which cajoled them into wretched acquiescence, or, on the other, at the mercy of men whose names have become everlastingly odious for their delight in human suffering. Who has estimated them fairly? Who has entered into the spirit of *The Scots Worthies* and *The Cloud of Witnesses?* Sir Walter, as a genuine Jacobite, held them up to derision in his *Old Mortality.* Buckle did the same, in a more conclusive way, in his *History of Civilisation in England.* Dean Stanley, as we might expect, cannot see their nobleness. John Hill Burton, learned Scotsman though he be, is too prosy and passionless. Nor, indeed, does Mr Story shew an impartial appreciation of them. He is kindliest to the Trimmers, and is content with the commonplace explanation of the devotion unto death of those who continued in arms till the Revolution. Then there are Napier's *Memoirs of Montrose and Claverhouse,* and Aytoun's *Lays,* to crown the edifice. If the biographer of John Knox and Andrew Melville had but given us their history![1] *It is still to be written.*

A characteristic trait of this piety of Carstares was his fervour in prayer, in which he excelled most of his contemporaries. In the age of Samuel Rutherfurd, "the true saint of the covenant,"[2] it was not easy to do this. Wodrow puts the man vividly before us.

"When he first entered on his Sabbath's work, he ordinarily prayed one hour, for he took in all the public things in that prayer. His band would have been all wet, as if it had been douked with tears, before he

[1] Does the reader know his *Review of Tales of my Landlord?* (*Works,* vol. iv. 1862.) If not, he has a pleasure in store. Dodd's *Fifty Years' Struggle of the Scottish Covenanters* (Edmonston and Douglas, 1860) is excellent in its way, but has all the faults of a series of popular lectures.

[2] Stanley, p. 87. The whole sketch, 87–92, is characteristically good.

was done with his first prayer. . . . . He was doing duty at the sacrament for a brother minister at Calder. He served the first table in a strange rapture, and he called some ministers there to the next, but he was in such a frame that none of them would come to take the work out of his hand. He continued at the work with the greatest enlargement and melting upon himself and all present, and served fourteen or sixteen tables."

After reading this we do not wonder his colleague should have said of him, that "such was the eminence of the grace of God in him, and so manifest was the presence of God with him, that I never did open my mouth where he was but with the greatest reluctance." This other illustration is equally, perhaps even more, striking. When the dissipated and reckless Earl of Rothes, the chancellor, lay dying, he sent for Carstares that *he might hear him pray.* So touching and beautiful were the prayers, that almost all who were present were moved to tears.[1]

It was characteristic of intense natures like this, in the earlier years of the Covenant, and more or less so till after the Revolution, to take up with unconditional political views as the only tenable ones; and we naturally therefore find Carstares a prominent man among the Protesters or extreme Covenanters. The burning questions of that time are mostly extinct volcanoes now; but they have left very memorable marks in the history and character of our country, which even in passing we must give heed to. It was this party, I may remind our readers, which was so remarkable for its tenacity of purpose and its "fanaticism," and which prolonged the deadly struggle with the Stuarts till the flight of James II. *It was this party which gave to the Middle period of Scottish history its special character, and its special significance and glory.* They had no idea of compromise, or of the profound meaning of the Greek proverb, that half a loaf is better than no loaf. They had to learn this. The realism just spoken of gave to every article of their political creed a meaning which compelled them to hold by it as a sacred whole. It was to them an indivisible embodiment of the truth which alone could save Scotland; and every modification of it was a fatal lowering of their standard of right and duty, which they dared not consent to. As was to be expected, this party has been

[1] Story; Steven's *History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam*, p. 57; and *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, March 1827.

maligned, misunderstood, and misrepresented. Who will say, however, that milder men and measures would have succeeded? Did the milder men succeed in anything, unless in saving themselves and getting into "pleasant places"? Mr Story, for instance, to take the latest example, gives proof enough of the outrageous and gratuitous tyranny of the times, yet he has only hard words for the party which it could not humble and crush. They not only remained unconquered, but with all their faults, which were many, it is perfectly certain they did more for the religious life of Scotland than their weaker expediency-loving brethren, the Resolutioners,[1] and were, as Mr Story himself tells us, the only men in the land who were deserving of the name of patriots. "This body," he says, "ever growing in stedfastness, and as oppression and misgovernment increased, becoming more distinctly the ark of refuge for the shattered liberties of Scotland, and the rallying point for all the disaffected, kept alive through years of persecution a political and religious enthusiasm of the keenest, though not of the purest, type, which won its triumph in 1688."[2] Of this oppression and misgovernment the elder Carstares had his full share, having been imprisoned, forced to flee "justice" and live in hiding, and forfeited both in person and estate. The triumph he never saw, as he died in Edinburgh early in 1686; but some of his latest words shewed what his presentiments were. Some one asked him as he was nearing his end what he thought now of the times and the state of the nation: "Notwithstanding all the successes and prevailings of these men against the people and work of God," he said, "I am persuaded *tandem bona causa triumphabit.*"

In the midst of influences natural to circumstances like these, under the shadow of the ancient cathedral church of Glasgow, young Carstares passed his boyhood, and had his first memories and stirrings of mind. We know nothing from himself of these years, and little about the steps by which he was led to adopt the career he afterwards pursued; but we do not need, for we can easily see from what we know of his father's house, how he could become what he was. It must have been

[1] Cunningham, *Church History of Scotland*, vol. ii. pp. 172, 173.

[2] See the close of M'Crie's *Review of Tales of my Landlord;* Dodds, pp. 300–305; Buckle, vol. iii. pp. 137–150, for some eloquent and powerfu advocacy of this party. And generally they have the best of it as compared with the Resolutioners.

the scene of many meetings and partings. He must there have seen many notable men in stern and in social mood, and heard many serious as well as racy conversations: for doubtless the accomplished and gentle Durham, the young and mystical Gray, quaint, witty Zachary Boyd, and the portly, business-minded Bailie,[1] with others of lesser note, were among his father's familiar guests, which would make his house in a time of intense and prolonged excitement quite a place of education for a quick but quietly observing boy. These influences would only be intensified and confirmed in their action after the Restoration, when Episcopacy was restored, Argyle and the leaders of the "fanatics" beheaded, the Covenant burnt by the common hangman, and when four hundred ministers were driven from their parishes in the winter of 1662, because they would not abjure their rights to freedom of conscience at the bidding of Middleton, a soldier of fortune, and his Drunken Parliament. Sitting as a lad of fourteen over his lessons in the still household, no longer brightened by his father's presence, what must he have felt when his mother, whom he most tenderly loved, and whose saintly influence was an abiding spell,[2] read him these words secretly brought to her from his father: "Charge Will to make earnest of seeking God, and to be diligent at his books;" or when, sometime after, he was a sharer of his father's perils in the wilds of the North of Ireland or the Mull of Cantyre, whither he had fled from the tender mercies of the traitor archbishop? These were experiences likely enough to influence powerfully a man's early years, and sufficient to shape and determine his maturer ones, as we find them.[3]

And they were continued through his manhood. He became a student of the University of Edinburgh in 1663, and took his degree in 1667; but side by side of his humane studies during these four years, occupying and heating his mind no doubt to their hindrance, were the religious and political questions of his day with which the western shires were ablaze. Young natures like his—susceptible, eager, and looking out for opinions and rules of action—walking the quiet Edinburgh streets and quieter College courts, would

[1] Story, p. 12; *Scots Worthies*, for lives of Durham, Gray, and Bailie.

[2] See his own words, Story, pp. 130, 132.

[3] Mr Burton thinks they would all tend the other way, *History of Scotland*, chap. lxxx., note at end.

certainly feel more interest in the Human than in the Humane; and with the Pentland Rising as the chief event of the previous winter, in which his father and his kinsfolk, the Mures of Caldwell, had a share, would have new occasion, and would find stronger reasons than they already had for coming to definite conclusions on morals and government.

"He saw his country writhing under the merciless dragonnades and exactions of fierce soldiers, such as Turner and Dalzell. He saw the prisons full of hapless victims, only released from the dungeon to be crushed in the boots, or marched to the gallows, or shipped to the plantations to be sold as slaves. He saw the ministers of the National Church driven from their homes and churches, celebrating the rites of their religion in secrecy and fear among the broken and scattered remnants of their flocks. He saw the places of the ancient pastors filled by those whom even one of their own order could but describe as worthless men of little learning, less piety, and no discretion. He saw his own father skulking from covert to covert like a felon, under a feigned name, unable, unless at peril of his life, to look on the face of wife or child, even in their days of sickness, sorrow, and death."[1]

He saw, in short, the most wicked and detestable government in modern history.[2]

This state of things was one which well might stir the wrath even to *saeva indignatio*, of a young man of his training and memories, and of his active, determined, and capable turn. And it was the natural soil of plottings and conspiracies. Could he look on his brethren's burdens and wrongs, and not meditate on the way to escape from them, or to checkmate and right them? Tyrannicide is an ugly subject; but who that has felt the mountings of the spirit of liberty, or conceived the agony of despair felt at iniquities flaunted openly by their doers who are above the law, and from whose power no man's house is safe, has not also felt that it cannot be always a crime? Conspiring and taking up arms against your 'lawful' sovereign, which is the next thing to tyrannicide, has received the sanction of modern history, and been illustrated in many memorable examples. But those sufferers and their forefathers were among the first to educate Western Europe into these political truths. Would young Carstares not be read in Buchanan's *De Jure Regni*

[1] Story, pp. 22, 23.

[2] See Hallam (whom everybody naturally defers to as an authority) on this period; *History of England*, chap. xvii. Lingard's account is characteristically brief and oblivious as regards the persecuted, and bland as regards the persecutor.

and Rutherfurd's *Lex Rex?* and, as one acquainted with their doctrines, be intensely influenced by the things he saw around him? Whether or not, the spectacle wrought upon him so, that when he took his degree, his friends thought it prudent he should stay no longer in Scotland. He was ready to rush into the fray; but he was too young to do the just cause any good, or to hope to escape the snares of the enemy. Presbyterian loyalty under such a government was impossible. If divinity must needs be further studied, it must be studied abroad. Accordingly, John Carstares sent his son, in his twentieth year, over to Holland to finish his theological education at the University of Utrecht. Little did either of them think of the 'education' which awaited the young student there, and of the historical consequences of the step.

On his way thither he passed through London, and spent some time there in the house of a particular friend of his father's, who kept up a correspondence with Holland,—seeing, among other things, how the light-hearted and wanton Charles ruled, and how the Duke of York stood in public favour. Here he took his first step in his public career. With a letter of introduction in his pocket from his father's friend to the Prince of Orange's physician, he left his native shores to carve out a name for himself in the cause and as a confessor of religious and political liberty. This letter laid the foundation of his future fortunes in life.[1]

The old but elegant episcopal city of Utrecht to which he went—the "cradle of liberty," as the Netherlanders had loved to call it since the signing of the famous Articles of 1579—was a most pleasant place to live in. It was a garrison town for Scotch and English regiments in the seventeenth century; but while, like Leyden and Rotterdam, and other considerable Dutch towns, it had a large British colony mostly composed of students and traders, with the usual accompaniments of a coffee-house and a church, its most interesting and noticeable class was the refugees from the tyranny of the Stuarts. These were numerous. Exiled from home and the scenes they most loved, they had much here to solace themselves with. Surrounded by trim gardens and orchards, and embowered in groves of beeches and lime trees, with busy canals fringed with poplars and crossed by innumerable bridges, with its

[1] M'Cormick, pp. 4, 5.

stately brick tower of St Martin's and its magnificent cathedral, its shady Mall and open walks beyond the gates, this seat of the once famous hard-fighting Frisian bishops was then, as it now is, one of the cheerfullest and most imposing towns in the provinces.[1]

This, of all places, was the one where the young Scot would have his early tendencies developed and directed. It was a "centre" of disaffection and conspiracy. Sauntering along its shady Mall, and over their cups in the coffee-room, many projects for the revolutionizing of England and Scotland had been, were now being, and would yet be mooted by nobles and lairds who, unlike the Lords of the Congregation a hundred years before, had hardly anything to win by a change but freedom of conscience. Into the midst of these exiles and malcontents Carstares' letter of introduction took him. It had brought him under the instant notice of Grand Pensionary Fagel, and that shrewd and skilful minister saw qualities in him which made him well worth enlisting in his royal master's service. Fagel accordingly presented him to William, who was also impressed by his discriminating knowledge of parties and affairs in North Britain, and pleased with his easy manner and address. The times were not yet ripe for a revolution, but if a revolution were to be successfully accomplished, the men who must do it would need to be tried as well as devoted men; and William was content just now to know where these could be found. It was enough to him that Carstares seemed to be a man admirably fitted for important secret service; and it was enough to Carstares to have the honour and the opportunity of pledging himself to William, and with his life in his hand daring to do everything which would hasten a better day, and fulfil the dying hope of his father and all who like him had died in faith. Meanwhile each had to wait till the one could serve the other in the good cause.

Sixteen long years he had to wait, with the other weary watchers for the dawn! Think of that, good reader! It is worth meditating upon by you and me, who reap a hundredfold of the fruits of the waiting, and patience, and unconquerable resolve of those men. It meant, on the one hand, the

[1] Steven, pp. 337, 266, 1; Story, p. 25; Motley's *Life and Death of John of Barneveld*, vol. ii. p. 227; Mackay's *Memoir of Sir James Dalrymple*, pp. 186–190; Calamy's *Life of Howe*, p. 146.

most wanton and irresponsible use of means which were intended for the well-being of the Commonwealth, and the pains and penalties of the stoniest-hearted of inquisitors. It meant, on the other, a fixed determination to oppose in every possible way and to overthrow, if possible, this state of things, and unquestionable tact, wariness, and insight. He who would make his hand felt in these circumstances could only be a man of clear insight, sure discrimination, and wise, swift decision. A pioneer in the jungle of tyranny, where unseen dangers lurked on every side, he could only spy out the land and make his ground sure behind him, or cut a path through it to the clear light of freedom beyond, by mixing conscientiousness and craftiness in wise proportions. His special function, to change the figure, would be always that of the silent, steady sapper, on the springing of whose mine the fate of the hour mostly depended.

Not a very "noble" calling, say some of my readers, thinking with a slight respectable shudder of Italian Carbonari or French Communists; yet a very necessary one, it will be allowed, for which all the nobler qualities are wanted, and in which they may have abundant scope. Carstares, at any rate, had no misgivings on the matter, nor had the most upright and distinguished statesmen and patriots of the period, the two Argyles, Bailie of Jerviswood, Lord Russell, and Algernon Sydney. It is easy for us to be squeamish; and we can afford to conjure up scruples. The iron has not entered our souls. There are times when honest men who love Truth and Freedom, and who prefer realities to superstitions, cannot but be plotters. Where open warfare with an intolerable evil is impossible, recourse must be had to secret craft; and the citadel which cannot be stormed, must be approached through trench and mine. This was such a time. Let us only use our historical imagination to conceive its real character and the actual condition of the nation, and we shall see that the misgovernment was such as made resistance the duty of the subject, and passive obedience the proof and badge of cowards and slaves. We are, therefore, not to honour those only who perished in the conflict and by a mere accident became martyrs, but those not less who braved all things, and were ready to suffer all things, and whose good work remains, but who were not counted victims of mark, were not what Beaton

called "high game," or who were more expert at concealing their hand, and lived to see the reward of their prolonged and heroic endurance. Fame dependent upon accident! It is a shame it so often is; a disgrace it has so long been so, owing to prejudice and ignorance.

We could not easily get a better illustration of the necessity for the application of this principle in our historical judgments than the case of Carstares during those years. We find everything in it which marks the man of devoted, high purpose, and of that rare metal which enables a man to carry this out in the teeth of every opposition. We find him, as in the Shaftesbury or Great Whig Plot, in which he was very deeply involved, a farther seeing man than most of his superiors, whose restlessness and ignorance of men and circumstances he had to check and direct as best he could.[1] Wherever he is, and whatever he may engage himself with for a time, his one abiding thought and aim is always the same. He has a hand in the chief plots, is deep in the secrets, and is one of the most active correspondents of the time. Sir George Mackenzie correctly described him as "the chaplain of the conspiracy." Until he leads the religious exercises of William's troops on the beach at Torbay, he slackens no effort, nor fails in sagacity and dauntlessness, in endeavouring to bring about the only constitutional remedy, that is, a revolution, for the miseries of the reign of the English Tiberius.

These traits of his character we distinctly realise on reading his famous examination and torture before the Privy Council in Edinburgh. He was brought before it for his connection with the Great Plot. It is a revolting scene, but a true, vivid picture, in which persecuted and persecutors appear as history knows them. Let us look at it as told by Mr Story.

"A little before noon he was taken out of the irons, and brought down to that long, low-browed chamber in the Parliament House, where the Privy Council held its sittings and tortured its victims. . . . The design of the Council was partly to satisfy the English Government, by proceeding against one of the most suspected of the Scotch accomplices in the recent conspiracy, but chiefly to extort from Carstares the secrets, which it was believed he possessed, relative to the plans of Argyle and the other malcontents abroad.

---

[1] M'Cormick, pp. 10–17. Story, chap. iv.

"It must have been with no ordinary anxiety that he took his place at the bar, for though prepared to disclaim all share in any plot against the king's life or the established monarchy, and to palliate his concurrence in the designs of Russell and Argyle, on the plea that they only aimed at the redress of existing grievances, he did not know whether or not any discovery had been made of his own private correspondence with the most trusted agents of the Prince of Orange. He had kept up this correspondence with Fagel and with Bentinck until the very time of his arrest in England. What the secrets of it were he would never, even after the Revolution, reveal; but Fagel spoke of them to Burnet *as affairs of the greatest importance, the betrayal of which would have secured his free pardon, and laid the king and government under lasting obligation to Carstares.* Of these secrets, however, the Scotch inquisitors were ignorant; and the question to which they addressed themselves was Carstares' engagement in and knowledge of the recent plot.

"After considerable parley about the outrageous illegality of the mode of questioning proposed by the Council, which Carstares firmly refused to comply with, the torture began. One of the bailies of Edinburgh and the executioner had been ordered to conduct the operation; and the king's smith was also in attendance with a new pair of thumbkins of improved construction. This little engine had been known in Muscovy, and brought home as a useful contribution to the resources of the executive by General Dalzell. It is not unlike a miniature pair of stocks in steel, with a strong central screw. The thumbs are inserted in two apertures, and the upper bar is screwed down till the bones are crushed! Carstares' thumbs were put in and screwed down till the sweat of his agony poured over his brow and down his cheeks. The Duke of Hamilton, who was entirely opposed to the torturing system, rose and left the Council-room, followed by the Duke of Queensberry, who exclaimed to the Chancellor, 'I see he will rather die than confess.' Perth ordered the executioner to give another turn, which was given with such violence that Carstares broke silence, and cried out, 'The bones are squeezed to pieces.' 'If you continue obstinate,' roared the Chancellor, 'I hope to see every bone of your body squeezed to pieces!' Again and again he was asked, would he answer the queries of the Council; and assured that if he did not, he should be tortured day by day while he had life. General Dalzell at last in a rage left his seat at the table, and coming close to the prisoner, vowed that he would take him and roast him alive the next day if he would not comply. Carstares did not waver for a moment. A sterner test must be applied, and the order was given for the boot. While his thumbs were still held fast in the thumbkins the boot was brought forward, and an attempt made to fit it on. The hangman, however, was so inexpert that he could not adjust the boot and the wedge. He had to take it off after a good deal of bungling, and applying himself anew to the thumbkins, turned the screw again and again until Carstares appeared to be going to swoon. The torture had now lasted 'near an hour and a-half.' The executioner was ordered to remove the thumbkins, but found them so driven home that he could not, and the

king's smith had to be sent for before the broken and mangled thumbs could be released. He was then sent back to the Tolbooth."[1]

—That is a Cameo from History of some rareness!

It was not his first experience of the Privy Council. In 1679 he left his prison in Edinburgh Castle after four and a-half years' confinement on account of his treasonable activities. At that time he learned where his enemies were weak and where he was strong. He had heard that he would find favour if he would but tell names, which "I hope," he writes, "through grace never to do. I bless the Lord my imprisonment hath put the thoughts of giving them satisfaction in this matter of names further from me than ever." Happily he was able to keep his brave resolve; in this fiery trial, "through grace," he bore himself with admirable prudence and conspicuous stoutness of heart.

It was his last experience, however. Bearing in his thumbs the marks of the tyranny which was crushing the life and thought out of his country, he lost no time in once more leaving it. Since he had left Holland, two years before, he had lain in four different prisons,—in the Gatehouse, the Tolbooth, the castles of Edinburgh and of Stirling. And this was only part of the price his love of liberty was costing him. The heaviest price, for the moment, was that his aged father had turned against him. Although he had himself, in his prime, striven against this same tyranny, he had now grown weary and moody, and thought exceedingly ill of his son's political leanings and complications. They were unbecoming a minister of the gospel; he would bring disgrace upon them all,—and so he would not even see him! The father was not unwilling to eat the crumbs which fell from the tyrant's table, and, in hope of better things, to accept the Indulgence. The son had other hopes; a fairer vision filled his eye. Meanwhile, like many a pioneer in the way of liberty, of truth, and of knowledge, he had to go on his way alone, trusting in God and in his own brave heart. Singularly self-gathered, shrewd, very

[1] Story, chap. v. After the Revolution, the thumbkins were presented by the Privy Council to Carstares (whose family still has them). King William expressed a wish to see them and to try them on. They were accordingly fastened on the royal thumbs, and Carstares gave the screw a courtier-like turn. "Harder," said the king, and another was given. "Again," and Carstares turned the screw pretty sharply. "Stop, doctor, stop," cried William, "another turn would make me confess anything."

patient, buoyant, and with a clear, steady glow of enthusiasm under all, which no pains and penalties had dulled or damped, he turned his eyes, with the braver and bolder spirits of that suffering time, to Holland, the only spot in Europe whence help was possible. "There a great company of exiles lamented their country's wrongs, and waited for the day of deliverance. There a young and sagacious Prince, the head of a free commonwealth, a Protestant and Presbyterian, was maintaining the rights of his people and the cause of religious liberty against all the might of France, and in spite of the hostility of England. If help was to be found anywhere, it must surely be found in Holland." This was in 1685.

In three years more the day of deliverance came, and England and Scotland were again free to their own children, and ruled according to the spirit of their common laws. These were three years of profound anxiety to William, and of ceaseless effort to William's party. Carstares comes into notice as one of this party. We find him carrying on an important correspondence with Sir James Stuart, who expressed the mind of James II., and whose letters did much to pave the way for the Revolution. This correspondence extended through the whole of 1687, and was regularly communicated to William. Carstares now lived at Leyden, the chief attraction of which was its nearness to the Hague and the court of the Prince of Orange. The great crisis, now fast ripening, depended very much for its success on accurate information on the state of public opinion, and on the characters of the public men of the two countries. The expeditions of Argyle and Monmouth had failed because of their untimely birth. William would not fail in his enterprise from a like reason, nor would he stir a foot until he had carefully sounded every part of his perilous way. *To do this was the special function of Carstares.* The Prince had not forgotten his past services. None knew his worth better, or felt his need more. He had not forgotten the secrets which Carstares had kept buried in his bosom despite torture, imprisonment, and even banishment, secrets which could not have been discovered without probably changing the verdict of history on some aspects of William's policy. He was accordingly admitted to the Prince's most confidential counsels, and in concert with Bentinck and Fagel and Burnet, discussed throughout that winter the momentous

questions of the hour. At the same time he was made one of the Prince's chaplains, and, in addition, was appointed to the second charge of the Scots Church in Leyden, a charge which William founded entirely on his account.

But this was the beginning of the end. The streaks of the long-looked for dawn were gladdening the distant horizon. The hour for striking the great blow in defence of the Protestant religion and the liberties of England was at hand, and, as William would have more need than ever of men like his newly-appointed chaplain, he ordered him to join his retinue. What mingled feelings must have agitated him as he sailed out of Helvoetsluys, in company with the most distinguished of the refugees, in the frigate which bore the Prince's flag, with its new and happily chosen device! What thankfulness and gratification for the past! what hopes and fears for the future! These feelings, which were not evanescent nor suppressed amid the bustle and excitement on board, found a fit opportunity for public expression on reaching Torbay. Nothing could be more appropriate, he thought, than for the army to engage in a solemn religious service as its first act on English ground. Did the thought of young Cleland at Drumclog, or of Cromwell at Marston Moor, blend with his feelings at the moment? Anyhow, his suggestion met with the cordial approval of William. Accordingly, when the troops had all landed, they were drawn up on parade, and Carstares at their head conducted divine service, after which, as they stood along the beach, they joined in singing the 118th Psalm before they encamped. A masterstroke of genius or tact, which made a profound impression both on soldiers and spectators.

In six weeks after James II. was a fugitive, his cause lost, and the country free. Carstares no longer needed to play the conspirator. More congenial, but, as it turned out, not less anxious work lay before him in this, the middle period of his career, in which all his strength and wisdom were fully tasked and finely displayed.

One of the first official acts of William in regard to Scotch affairs, was to appoint Carstares to be chaplain to their Majesties for Scotland, intimating at the same time that he required his constant attendance upon his person, and assign-

ing him apartments in his own palace when in England, and expenses for camp equipage when in the field. This was simply the official sanction of his place in the king's counsels. As a clergyman of the Church of Scotland, he could hold no higher post in connection with the Court; but every one knew that on all Scotch affairs he was William's confidential adviser and secretary, and had more of his confidence and more influence with him than any other person. It was well for Scotland and the Revolution that William had such a man to advise with. When we look closely into the state of parties and opinion which existed then, and consider the measures which alone could meet the public wants, and the measures which became law, we shall clearly see this. Scotland was remote; if measured by the hour, it was as far from London then as St Petersburg is now. Its factions were embittered with a bitterness hardly known in England, and such as had not been known in Holland since the days of John of Barneveld. Its political life was utterly demoralised. It had, moreover, a peculiar trouble almost native to itself. At a time when continental statesmen, accepting the principles of Cardinal Richelieu, were trying to divorce things sacred from things secular, the chief men in Scotland were almost theocratic in opinion, and unable therefore to imagine that it might be right to separate matters of faith from matters of government. That familiar knowledge of the questions which were inevitable in such circumstances, and of the persons on whom their settlement must chiefly depend, which he himself could not have, nor indeed cared to acquire, William had ready to hand in Carstares. Him he knew, and could implicitly trust. And such had been their relations in the past, such the devotion of the one and the confidence of the other, that it was highly probable that whatever political crisis might arise in connection with the settling of the government of Scotland, the sagacity and personal knowledge of the subject would be the guide and stay of the sovereign.

The first thing to be settled was whether Scotland should be Presbyterian or Episcopalian. A good deal could be said in favour of the Episcopal Church. William himself was a Presbyterian; but the form of religious worship was nothing to him. Hence, although a Presbyterian among his countrymen, because they would not have bishops to rule over them, he was an Episcopalian in England, because her people would

On one point, and on one point only, was he most earnest and most resolute, and that was, that religious toleration should be granted to all his subjects! With these views, it is needless to say that he was certain to meet with insurmountable difficulties in dealing with the religious questions of his new kingdoms. Neither presbyter nor bishop could see eye to eye with him on this point. It was natural for him, as a Netherlander, to think in this way; but the thing, however beautiful in Milton's or Jeremy Taylor's prose, was quite unknown in the common practice of England and Scotland.

These differences of opinions meet us on the very threshold of William's reign. The one breathes through the famous *Claim of Right*, which was prepared by a select committee, and adopted by the Convention of Estates. One of the declarations in it is, that Prelacy and the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters is, and has been, a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and therefore ought to be abolished. The other we see on the occasion of William taking the Coronation Oath, and see it clashing with that other. The last clause makes the king swear that "he shall root out all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God, that shall be convicted by the true kirk of God of the foresaid crimes." When the Earl of Argyle, who read the oath, came to this clause, William paused and said, "I will not lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor." With the new turn of affairs had come a new epoch, and a king who would quickly bend his subjects to his mind and the demands of the time! It was a good omen for the future that such sentiments had been spoken from the throne; but how far these would influence and determine that future would very much depend on those who surrounded it, and mediated between the Crown and the Church.

*William Carstares was raised up and qualified by all his previous life for this all-important work.* If mediation between the Crown and the Church was the one thing needing to be done for Scotland, he was fitted as no other to do it. He knew what religious persecution and its deplorable consequences were; and he had seen the blessings and tasted the sweets of toleration in his second home, Holland. He at least did not need the powerful arguments which John Locke had just penned from Utrecht in his famous *Letters*, to convince him that freedom of

conscience was each man's inalienable right, and religious persecution a wickedness and a blunder. Moreover, his experiences had made it impossible for him to believe that bishops were vessels of special divine grace. He had found and seen more Christian love in a land where there were none than he had found or seen at the hands of Archbishop Sharp and his consecrated companions in cruelty. The form of church government was not the essential thing. What mattered it if the Church herself was fair as the moon and clear as the sun with the graces of her divine Lord? Was not the best and the one only convincing proof of her divine origin the fact that in her midst dwelt a visible unworldly, sin-conquering, loving spirit?

These were novel views, and in fact were quite "modern." Carstares had long parted from the narrow spirit of his fathers, which he did not doubt had been natural and justifiable in their circumstances; and had no sympathy with the querulous, fantastical, hairsplitting tendencies which still prevailed among his countrymen. Did they not discern the signs of the times? If they would hold by the past they must, if wise, at least prepare for, and if possible anticipate, the future. The old views in the new order would not do. The thoughts of men had been widened by recent events; and it would be simply recognising this to see to it with all speed and good feeling that the walls of their common Jerusalem were rebuilt on broader foundations than the last, with ampler courts and opener gates. But it was because he held these views that he was able to influence successfully the ecclesiastical affairs of his country. He was the first Scottish Churchman who brought down theoretical church questions from the clouds, and put them on the ground of practical convenience. And he did this for what seemed to him the best of reasons. No one knew better the value and meaning of the sufferings of the past forty years; but these did not blind him to his duty and to the duty of the Church in their altered circumstances. The Covenants had served their day and generation nobly, and had handed down a priceless possession, with many immortal memories; but it was clear as day to him that they were no longer needed. They had become things of the past, and must now be left behind with its other memorials; and if the Church would be equal to her opportunity, they must have no distinct, narrowing influence on the Revolution settlement. It was emphatically a time for

forbearance, patience, and large-mindedness. The jars, divisions, and mystical shibboleths which had distracted and deluded the Church must be given up. The heroic virtues must give place to the prudential ones; and precisely in proportion as these were forthcoming could she hope that her broken walls would be restored and her gates made beautiful. Toleration and comprehension were the two ideas of William's ecclesiastical policy; and Carstares believed that, in a modified form, they were quite practicable even in Scotland.

If we turn now to the ecclesiastical history of the period, we shall find the name of Carstares on every page of it, endeavouring to carry out these principles. How he did this; how he formed and guided the policy of the king in the re-establishment of Presbyterianism in 1689 and 1690; how he laboured to heal, restore, and rebuild; how far he succeeded; how far and why he failed, as on the question of patronage; how he was understood and regarded by his contemporaries—these are told us by Mr Story in his best style, and with a fulness and judiciousness which leave nothing to be desired.[1] This portion of our national story is little known. It was not an heroic age; and certainly we are under very strong temptations to pass it over. The details, indeed, as is well said by the above-named writer, can now hardly be the object of very keen human sympathy. The mutual jealousies of Presbyterians and Episcopalians,—the harshness of the one, the stiffness of the other—occupy the foreground so noisily and obtrusively, and cross each other in such involved movement, that one is apt to watch them rather with a sense of wearied confusion than of hearty interest. The scene is ennobled by none of the heroic lights and shadows of Knox's conflict with the ancient Church. Its tameness is not stirred by any of the rough but hardy independence of Andrew Melville's wrestlings with King James. It lacks alike the wild fire of the early covenant and the rich lustre of the varied learning and sound churchmanship which give weight to the counsels and dignity to the contests of Henderson and Baillie.[2] For all that, the work which then fell to be done was as needful as any done in earlier times, and called for no less earnestness and skill, and for fully more devo-

[1] How singularly bitter he is, though, towards the Scotch Episcopals! It is suggestive to compare his and Stanley's remarks on them.

[2] Story, p. 201.

tion, as being work done often silently and out of sight, amid a hundredfold meaner annoyances, and sustained by no loud encouragements of popular applause. The best of this work was done by Carstares, either directly or indirectly. He was the first great preacher of the new National Covenant. He is the one figure of the period cast in heroic mould; and the one and only touch of romance it has is an incident of which he was the hero.

This incident brings out so clearly all that is here claimed for him, that no estimate of his character would be complete without it. It happened in 1694, and happened thus. The Crown and the Church had been pulling opposite ways for some time, and William in consequence had assumed the high hand. The King believed that the Church was dealing too harshly with the Episcopal incumbents; the Church believed that the King was absurdly well affected towards them. To make matters worse, the Church grew mulish, and the Assembly of 1692 had to be summarily dissolved after a month's sederunt. This summary dissolution kindled much resentment; and in the following year this feeling rose to the highest pitch, in consequence of a fresh offence done it. "An Act for settling the quiet and peace of the Church," as it was soothingly called, had been passed in Parliament, which required the Church to admit the incumbents on certain conditions, and also demanded the calling of a General Assembly. The Church was in a ferment, and loudly exclaimed about Episcopalian craft and royal Erastianism. The King was out of hearing, however, although at the best rather indifferent about Scottish Church affairs. He had been listening to Tarbat, whose personal leanings were towards Episcopacy, and to the Master of Stair, to whom churches, parties, and principles were only so many pieces on the political chess-board, to be moved hither or thither, or swept aside, as best suited his purpose. Having made up his mind, in ignorance of the actual state of feeling at the moment, he called an Assembly, and sent down orders to Lord Carmichael, who was the Commissioner, that the ministers must acknowledge his authority before they took their seats, and that if they refused to do so, the Assembly was to be dissolved. This brings us to the incident itself, as told by M'Cormick, Carstares' first biographer and grand-nephew.[1]

[1] M'Cormick, pp. 58-61.

"After Lord Carmichael's arriving in Edinburgh, and communicating his orders to some of the clergy in town, he found them obstinate in their resolutions not to comply. They assured him that their sentiments upon the subject were the same with those of all their brethren in the country; and that if this measure were persisted in, it would spread a flame over the country which it would not be in the power of such as had given His Majesty these counsels to extinguish.

"The Commissioner saw that all his attempts to bring them to better temper would be vain and fruitless. At the same time he was sensible that the dissolution of the Assembly would not only prove fatal to the Church of Scotland, to which he was a real friend, but also to His Majesty's interest in that kingdom. From a sincere regard to both, therefore, he undertook to lay the matter, as it stood, fairly before the king; and for that purpose sent off a flying packet, which he expected to return from London with the king's final determination the night before the Assembly was appointed to meet. At the same time the clergy sent up a memorial to Mr Carstares (who happened to be away from court on leave of absence), urging him to use his good offices in this critical conjuncture, for the preservation of that Church which he had so active a hand in establishing.

"The flying packet arrived at Kensington in the forenoon of that day upon which Mr Carstares returned. But before his arrival His Majesty, by the advice of Lord Stair and Lord Tarbat, who represented the obstinacy of the clergy as an act of rebellion against his government, had renewed his instructions to the Commissioner, and sent them off by the same packet.

"When Mr Carstares came to Kensington and received his letters, he immediately inquired what was the nature of the despatches His Majesty had sent off for Scotland; and upon learning their contents, he went directly, and in His Majesty's name, required the messenger who was just setting off, to deliver them up to him. It was now late at night, and as he knew no time was to be lost, he ran to His Majesty's apartment; and being informed by the lord in waiting that he was gone to bed, he told him it was a matter of the last importance which had brought him at that unseasonable hour, and that he must see the king.

"Upon entering the chamber he found His Majesty fast asleep, upon which, turning aside the curtain, and falling down upon his knees, he gently awaked him. The king, astonished to see him at so late an hour, and in this posture by his bedside, asked him, 'What was the matter?' He answered, 'he had come to ask his life.' 'And is it possible,' said the king, 'that you have been guilty of a crime that deserves death?' He acknowledged he had, and then produced the despatches he had brought back from the messenger. 'And have you,' says the king with a severe frown, 'have you indeed presumed to countermand my orders?' Mr Carstares then begged leave only to be heard a few words, and he was ready to submit to any punishment His Majesty should think proper to inflict.

. . . . . .

"The king heard him with great attention, and when he had done,

gave him the despatches to read, and desired him to throw them in the fire; after which he bade him draw up the instructions to the Commissioner in what terms he pleased, and he would sign them. Mr Carstares immediately wrote to the Commissioner signifying that it was His Majesty's pleasure to dispense with putting the oaths to the ministers; and when the king had signed it he immediately despatched the messenger, who, by being detained so many hours longer than he intended, did not arrive in Edinburgh till the morning of the day fixed for the sitting of the Assembly.

"By this time both the Commissioner and the clergy were in the utmost perplexity. He was obliged to dissolve the Assembly; they were determined to assert their own authority, independent of the civil magistrate. To their inexpressible joy they were relieved by the return of the packet countermanding the dissolution of the Assembly."

*Was it a mistake to call this man the "second Founder" of the Church of Scotland?* It is beyond controversy that he was "the person who persuaded King William to settle Presbytery in Scotland;"[1] and it is equally so that "that midnight interview decided that for evil or for good Scotland in future was to be emphatically Presbyterian."[2] Where is the difference between the two statements? No matter how closely we look into the ecclesiastical events of this period, we shall as distinctly mark the influence of his clear, decisive, charitable spirit, which was willing to be all things to all men in the true apostolic meaning, as we mark the terrible unbending scorn and rude humorous zeal of Knox in the Reformation period.

After reading of this "famous instance of his power, unique in the history of Princes and Churches,"[3] we see the point and appropriateness of the nickname of "Cardinal," by which he was usually known at court. This was in allusion to the saying of Isabella of Spain's great minister, Cardinal Ximenes, that he could play at foot-ball with the heads of the Castilian courtiers. And indeed it is a most remarkable and even impressive spectacle to see this plain Presbyterian minister holding the threads of the King's Scottish policy in his own hands, drawing up minute after minute for consideration in the royal closet, and being the final referee in most appointments to office. The great mass of his correspondence preserved by his first biographer proves how completely communication between Scotland and William lay under Carstares' control. Every question touching the government of the northern kingdom seems to

[1] Dalrymple, quoted by Story, p. 165. [2] Stanley, p. 117.
[3] Story, p. 244. And all the writers on this period.

have been laid before him, and every measure ruled, more or less, by his advice. Rarely in any age, and not at all in that age, has so much power been used so modestly and beneficently. No one spot tarnishes his good name. Neither insolence, selfishness, nor pride had any place in him or in his ways. The principles which guided him in these matters are expressed in one of his characteristic replies to a needy noble who had been begging a place for a needier friend, and were these: "The good of my country, the satisfaction of friends, and the contenting of honest men in general."

None knew better than William himself that these were his principles. Amongst a multitude who sought their own advantage, and were ready to serve him or betray him for the highest bribe, William knew he could always find in this one man an unselfish fidelity, a patriotism as incorruptible as Knox's, or Melville's, or Marvell's, and counsel which was neither warped by personal ends, nor inflamed by political or ecclesiastical ambition. And he honoured him accordingly.

"One morning," says the gossiping Wodrow, "when the king was in the closet, some Scotsmen fell a speaking to the king anent Mr Carstares, and they told him it was the mind of his best friends he should be removed from about him; and the English bishops were taking umbrage that he should have so much of his ear. The king gave them no answer. Within a while the king came forth to the chamber of presence, and the onwaiters, nobility, and others, made a lane for him to go through them. At the entry of the lane Mr Carstares stood. The king bowed to all as he came through them; when he came near to Mr Carstares he put out his hand to him, and said in the hearing of all, 'Honest William Carstares, how is all with thee this morning?' This was answer enough to his accusers."

More decisive still—nothing could be more so—of his profound regard for his chaplain and counsellor, was a gift to him on his deathbed of a gold ring, containing a lock of his hair; and these words concerning him, so like those others: "I have known him long, and I knew him thoroughly, and I know him to be a truly honest man."

After the death of William, Carstares, of course, ceased to have any place in royal counsels, or any direct management in Scottish affairs. It was not to be supposed, however, that a man of his rare experience and wisdom, especially at such a period, would be allowed to rust in retirement, or that he

himself, so long an honoured soldier in the cause of liberty and progress, and still in the prime of life, should desire to go into obscurity. Ere long an honourable position presented itself: in the year after the death of his great patron, he was elected Principal of the University of Edinburgh. A new career of national usefulness awaited him here.

If there were any who demurred to his appointment on the score of unfitness, he speedily gave them cause to think well of him; for so uncommon were his Latin orations, which he delivered at the opening of each Session, that they made his most fastidious hearers fancy themselves transported to the Forum of ancient Rome. Shortly after he was appointed, in addition to this office, to Greyfriars' Church. It was while here that a story is told of him which puts his manner and influence as a Churchman so vividly before us that room must be found for it. About the time of the Union a national fast had been appointed, which the violent opposers of that scheme amongst the clergy would not observe. Mr Carstares had given his advice against the appointment; but, as a zealous friend of the Union, he observed the fast. His colleague, who was equally zealous in his opposition to that measure, not only refused to observe it, but next Sunday took occasion in the forenoon sermon to throw out some bitter reflections upon the Union in general, and upon certain contrivers and promoters of it in particular, who, he alleged, were traitors to their country, and to the Church of Scotland, and had too great influence over their deluded brethren.

"As this violent attack was directly pointed at Mr Carstares, it fixed the eyes of the congregation upon him, whilst with great composure he began to turn over the leaves of his Bible. His colleague's discourse being considered by the people as a formal challenge to Mr Carstares to vindicate his conduct, a great crowd, from all corners of the city, were assembled to hear him in the afternoon, when he gave out for the subject these words of the psalmist, 'Let the righteous smite me, it will not break my bones.' From which he took occasion, with great calmness of temper, to vindicate his colleague from any suspicion of being deficient in regard and affection for him, that though he differed from him in his sentiments upon some points, yet he was sure both of them had the same end in view; and that, as he knew the uprightness of his colleague's intentions, and the goodness of his heart, he was determined to consider any admonitions or rebukes directed to himself from that place as the strongest expressions of his love."[1]

[1] M'Cormick, p. 73.

It was this eminently Christian temper, combined with his sagacity and general breadth of view, enabling him to forecast and provide for the changes of the future, which shone out conspicuously during the third and last period of his life, and which leaves the impression upon our minds of his being one of the noblest of Christian patriots, and, without doubt, "one of the most illustrious benefactors of the Scottish Church and nation."[1]

When Carstares transferred his residence from London to Edinburgh, clouds were darkening the political sky, and already had been heard some mutterings of the coming storm. That imbroglio was beginning which was to end in the Union; and Jacobite stratagems, Episcopal pretensions, Presbyterian jealousies, national prejudices, personal dishonesties, and political corruptions, had already began to shew themselves. The presence of this calm and judicious churchman, bringing his wide experience of courts, councils, and camps to this narrow and fiery centre of Scotch life and action at Edinburgh, must have been a felt blessing to the few wise and honest patriots who were taking their share in forwarding the good of their country; while to his fellow-churchmen his name was a tower of strength. All had a vague unnerving dread of mischief and misfortune about to happen. The people generally thought the Union an abject surrender of their national independence; a feeling which found its rhetorical expression in Belhaven's famous speech. The Church was afraid of the consequences that would happen to Presbyterianism. The Cameronians were prepared for the worst. This one thing only was clear to all, to friends and foes alike, that nearly everything as regarded its success or failure was in the hands of the clergy.[2] At this crisis, Carstares was elected Moderator of the General Assembly. Its meeting was satisfactory. Those who had watched for the halting of the Church were disappointed; Carstares, in his calm impressive way, being able to say in his closing address:

"Many who wish not well to our interest have these days past come hither to spy out our liberty, and to catch at something that might be matter for their drollery; but they have seen the beauty of our harmony, the calmness with which our debates have been managed, the order that

[1] Stanley, p. 116.

[2] Story, p. 275. Cunningham, vol. ii. pp. 334–5. M'Cormick, p. 75.

hath been in our proceedings, and the civil authority of the magistrates and the spiritual power of the Church kindly embracing each other. They saw it: they marvelled. They were troubled, and hasted away."

Four times in eleven years he was elected Moderator, an honour borne by no other name in the Scottish Church. Each time when he was raised to the office either a crisis was imminent or dangers were feared. His high character, his skill in ruling debate, his words weighted with an experience possessed by no other member of that Court, his unquestioned knowledge of men and parties, all drew his fellow-churchmen to him on these occasions as to their natural leader; and on each occasion he acquitted himself to the satisfaction "of honest men in general." In 1705, he induced them to support the Union, as the true policy of the Church no less than of the country. In 1708, the year after it had become law, he allayed their imaginary fears and their real irritation. In 1711, he presided when the Greenshields case was in every one's mind; and in 1715, when the flames of Jacobite rebellion were kindling in the north, he was again in the Moderator's chair.

Could we get a stronger proof of the place Carstares held in the eyes of his country? And what his influence must have been we can easily imagine, when we remember that the General Assembly was yet unbroken in its power, could still launch its excommunications with effect, and was to the body of Presbyterians the voice of authority. This influence, as before, was consistently used on the side of righteousness and Presbyterian liberty. Peace, but not peace at any price; toleration, but not toleration for party ends; comprehension, but not comprehension in an obviously absurd sense, were what he argued for, advised, and achieved.[1] At a time when the old leaven of national intolerance and prejudice were stirred to their depths, and trifles seemed things of vital importance, this man's greatness was seen in repressing momentary considerations, and rising to general principles. How different would have been the issue, poor enough as that

[1] On these points see Story (ch. xviii.), whose view of Carstares' action in regard to the Toleration and the Patronage Acts is, I think, the true one; also Cunningham (vol. ii. p. 355), who is not correct, in my opinion, in his estimate of the Toleration Act, although excellent, as usual, on the Patronage Act.

may seem to have been, had the Church been led by a man of narrower, noisier views, or who cared more for his party than for the commonweal! How easy to have plunged Church and State into chaos! Well might Queen Anne thank him personally for his services, and her chief statesmen feel assured that nothing would go wrong when his hand was on the helm. Well might the Elector, who was watching the course of events, and waiting hopefully at Hanover, speak of the Presbyterians of Scotland as his "best friends," and encourage their leader by his approving words.

But now with these, the main outlines of Carstares' career before us, let us turn aside for a little, and notice his manner of life and private character. These, happily, we have had described to us by more than one who knew him long and intimately. Whatever may be thought of his public actions, and however they may be interpreted, these indications of the spirit which was in the man will, at anyrate, help us to understand them better.

First of all, no one will have any difficulty, I think, in picturing the appearance of the man. From all we know of him already, we imagine him to have had a face which would attract us. His portrait confirms us in our fancy. Much keenness, force, quiet honest look, strong social instincts, and a general cheerfulness, are evident in it,—the qualities which are everywhere seen in his life. How touching are these two incidents, very illustrative at the same time of the man!

"When he was imprisoned in the castle at Edinburgh, a little boy of twelve years old, son of Erskine of Cambo, governor of the castle, in the course of his rambles through the court, came to the grate of Carstares' apartment. As he always loved to amuse himself with children, he went to the grate and began a conversation. The boy was delighted, and every day came to the prison-grate—told him stories, brought him provisions, took his letters to the post, was unhappy if Carstares had no errand to send and no favour to ask. When Carstares was released, they parted with tears on both sides. One of the first favours that Carstares asked of King William was that he would bestow the office of Lord Lyon on his young friend, to whom he owed so much; and he obtained it, with the additional compliment that it should be hereditary in the family. So in fact it continued, till it was unfortunately forfeited by the engagement of Erskine's eldest son in the rebellion of 1745.

"Another story illustrates the freshness and simplicity of his pastoral character, amongst the absorbing public affairs which occupied him.

His sister, the wife of a Fifeshire clergyman, had become a widow. Carstares had just arrived in Edinburgh from London, to transact business with King William's ministers. She came over to Edinburgh, and went to his lodgings. They were crowded with the nobility and officers of State; and she was told she could not see him. 'Just whisper, said she to the servant, 'that I desire to know when it would be convenient for him to see me.' He returned for answer, '*Immediately*,' left the company, came to her, and most affectionately embraced her. On her attempting to apologise, 'Make yourself easy,' he said; 'these gentlemen are come hither, not on my account, but their own. They will wait with patience till I return. You know I never pray long.' And so, after a short fervent prayer, suited to her circumstances, he fixed the time for seeing her more at leisure, and returned in tears to the company."[1]

As a minister, we read "that he was equally diligent and prudent, and applied himself with the greatest cheerfulness to the lowest and most toilsome offices thereof. He had an admirable gift, both of prayer and preaching; chose always to insist on the most weighty and important subjects of religion; and delivered his sermons so gravely and distinctly and with such an acceptable pathos, as never failed to fix the attention of his hearers, and greatly to promote their edification. His sermons were of that sort as be understood by the meanest capacities, and admired by the best judges." But what more need we than the sermon preached in reply to his colleague, to prove his power in that way? There are several other illustrations, however, of this told us by the younger Calamy.

As a leader in the Church Courts, "his manner of speaking was calm, sententious, and decisive. Such was the respect for his character, that one sentence from him would often extinguish in a moment the most violent flame in the house. This authority which he had acquired he knew well how to maintain. In matters of lesser account he seldom spoke at all; in business of consequence he spoke only at the close of the debate, and it was a rare instance in which any adventured to speak after him."

As to his character generally, contemporary history is at one, and describes it thus:

"As his piety was unfeigned, so his charity was unbounded, more so indeed than his circumstances could well afford; for, whilst he had one farthing remaining in his pocket, he could not turn aside from any

[1] M'Cormick. Stanley.

necessitous object that claimed his assistance. This was so well known to the poor that, whenever he went abroad, he was perpetually harassed by them, and was at last obliged to submit to a regulation, proposed to him by one of his friends who knew his foible ; which was, to put only so much money in his pocket as he could conveniently spare for the purposes of ordinary charity.

"Amidst that publicity of business in which he was perpetually engaged, it is remarkable that he found abundance of leisure for the duties of hospitality. His house was a place of resort to all the youth of the best families and the most promising hopes, who were generally recommended to his attention during their course at the university ; and he failed not to improve the opportunities which his station afforded him, of instilling into their minds, along with an ardour for study, the best regulations for their future conduct. Many of them, who have since acted their part in the most conspicuous stations, have not scrupled to own that it was to him they were indebted for the best maxims both in public and private life. . . . .

"The clergy of all denominations were welcome to his family ; particularly such of the Episcopal clergy as were deprived of their livings at the Revolution. He always treated them with peculiar tenderness and humanity. He often relieved their families when in distress, and took care to dispense his charities in such a manner as he knew would be least burthensome to them. Some of them, who were his yearly pensioners, never knew from what channel their relief flowed, till they found by his death that the source of it was dried up."

This good and great man, whose heart so often warmed to suffering, which his hand was prompt to relieve, and whose clear and calm mind and persuasive voice had so long led the councils of his church, was struck down with apoplexy, on 28th December 1715, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. A little while before his death, those who watched beside him heard him say, "I have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

When his body was laid in the dust, in the venerable graveyard of his own Church of Greyfriars, two men were observed to turn aside from the rest of the company, and bursting into tears, bewail their mutual loss. Upon inquiry, it was found that they were two Episcopal nonjurors, whose families for a considerable time had been supported by his benefactions.[1]

Surely as beautiful and strong a character as the Scottish Church has had!

"A courtier, he never used the royal favour for his private ends. A churchman, he never sought to separate the interests of his order from the interests of the nation. A statesman of rare sagacity and knowledge

[1] M'Cormick.

of state-craft, yet forbidden to enter in person the arena of public politics, he stood by without jealousy, ill-will, or intrigue, content if, through his private influence, he could impart to the policy of others a character that should be just, tolerant, and liberal. His principles and his action were free from all harshness and violence of extremes. A Presbyterian, bred in an age of prelatic persecution and sacerdotal arrogance, he was indulgent to differences of religious opinion, government, and ritual. A liberal, in days when political parties gave no quarter in their embittered strife, his liberalism was calm with the wisdom of experience, pure from all passion of the mob, large in its scope, constructive and conservative even in the midst of reform and revolution.

"That the 'Revolution Settlement,' in Church and State, was firmly established in Scotland; that the Union was peaceably effected; that the Church, instead of splitting into a number of hostile and fanatical sects, gradually accommodated itself to that relation with the State which at once guaranteed its constitutional freedom, and equipped it most efficiently for its sacred work,—was mainly owing to Carstares. Men who wield the sword and die in battle, and men who, with flaming zeal and quenchless energy, lead stormy factions in days of popular excitement, stamp their names in deeper impress upon the common memory than those who do the more quiet, thoughtful, and laborious work of controlling the impatient and inexperienced, and guiding the general intelligence and action. But when the havoc of the more hasty and passionate work has swept past, the result of the more quiet and orderly abides, although the names of the workers may be forgotten. For one Scotsman who has heard the name of Carstares, thousands are familiar with that of Dundee, though the actual life's work of the one is woven into the very framework of our national being and political constitution, and that of the other has been long since cast into the limbo of unremembered vanities. The verdict of History ought to redress the injustices of popular opinion and ignorant caprice, and raise the statues of real heroes to their pedestals. To it the memory of Carstares appeals; and I believe it will accord him, as he deserves, a place among the best and highest in the long and splendid roll of those Scotchmen who have deserved well of the republic."[1]

History will do this in her own calm, certain way. The more the mists of the Past clear off from the fields of conflict and controversy, and men are judged by their influence and work, the clearer will the unassuming figure of William Carstares appear as the chief one in the Revolution era. He left no memorials behind him but his life; and history impartially surveying that, will rank him among our greatest, and place him beside Knox, Melville, Henderson, and Chalmers.

[1] Story, pp. 367-8. And see Stanley, whose estimate of him is as high.

ALEXANDER FALCONER.

## REPRINTED ARTICLES.

### I. *Galilee in the Time of Christ (Part II.).**

BY REV. SELAH MERRILL, ANDOVER, MASS.

XIII. *Religion, Education, and Morals among the Galileans.*—We come now to speak of the religious character of the Galileans, with which may be associated the kindred topics of morals and education. On these points we would not presume to speak, except after the most careful study. It is a most difficult matter to separate the Galileans from the people of Judea, and say that they possessed this or that characteristic, in distinction from the latter. Still, there is evidence to enable us to do this to some extent; at least, it can be shown that the Galileans were equally interested with the Judeans in all matters pertaining to education and religion. Indeed, in some respects, the advantage in regard to religion and morals will be found to be on the side of the Galileans. The impression is often given that away from the Temple, in the far northern province, ignorance and irreligion prevailed. The statement is made that "they manifested less aversion to the religion and manners of the heathen than the people of the south, and less zeal for the religion of Moses."[1] Also, that "from their heathen neighbours the Galileans imbibed all sorts of superstitions. Nowhere else were there so many persons possessed and plagued with evil spirits as in Galilee; since the Galilean narrow-mindedness ascribed all forms of disease to the influence of demons."[2] Their religious character is further described as a singular mixture of faith and superstition.[3] It is supposed that before the destruction of Jerusalem this province was especially poor in regard to means for disseminating knowledge (understand, *knowledge of the law*, the only thing which "knowledge" meant to the Jews), and on this account "the Galileans were stricter and more tenacious in regard to

[1] Munk, xxxiii. col. 1. [2] Graetz, iii. 395, who gives several refs. to Talmud.
[3] Graetz, iii. 394.

* From the *Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Eclectic* for April last. The First Part was reprinted in our last number.

customs and morals" than the people of the south.[1] And by still another we are informed that, on account of the picturesque scenery and delightful climate of Galilee, the mind, away from the influence of the religious formalism which existed in Jerusalem, would naturally devote itself more to parables and legends.[2] We are not prepared to accept these statements, nor any one of them, as final in this matter. The first two, those of Graetz and Munk, are decidedly wrong. But since, among the Jews, "education" meant merely *education in religion*, the two naturally blend together in our treatment of them. That passage in Josephus is very significant which states that during the reign of Queen Alexandra (79–70, or 78–69 B.C.) the Pharisees arose to power—"a sect reputed to excel all others in the accurate explanation of the laws."[3] This means no less than that there was at that time a revival of biblical study. At the death of Herod the Great we hear of two celebrated teachers, Judas and Matthias, whose "explanation of the laws many young men attended."[4] But they do not appear to have taught in any special school, nor to have belonged to any organised school system whatever. The famous Hillel was not trained for a teacher; but he began to teach, and the result proved his natural fitness for that work.[5] Neither Hillel nor Gamaliel, the teacher of young Saul, belonged to any college or seminary or other institution of learning, *i.e.* in our meaning of those words. There could not be a school system where instructors (here the Rabbis) were not allowed to receive pay for their labour. Whoever understood the law thoroughly, and had facility in explaining it, provided he chose to teach, was regarded as a "learned man"—a Rabbi.[6] In Christ's time there were no schools which it

[1] Graetz, iii. 394.

[2] Neubauer, 185. In order to make Galilee appear as backward as possible, Neubauer, p. 75, states, on the authority of himself, that "this province possessed no wise men, and still less a school."

[3] Wars, i. 5. 2. [4] Wars, iii. 33. 2.

[5] Hillel, 30 B.C.—A.D. 10. Simon, his son, A.D. 10–30; Gamaliel, son of Simon, A.D. 30–50.

[6] Ant. xx. 11. 2; Hausrath, i. 77; full statement of this subject in Gfrörer, pp. 156–161, and the names of a number of Rabbis given who supported themselves by some trade—as all did; yet a "schoolmaster" might take pay, Ibid. p. 158.

NOTE.—Of the statements of the Talmud in regard to schools and public

was necessary to have attended, or at which it was necessary to have graduated, in order to be regarded as a learned man. The only schools were those connected with the synagogues. The only school-book was the Hebrew Scriptures. A synagogue presupposed a school,[1] just as in our country a church presupposes a Sunday-school. Church and district-school is not a parallel to the Jewish system of things, but church and Sunday-school is. Synagogues were found in every city throughout the land, and also in every village, unless the place was insignificant in size, and even in such cases they had their place or places of prayer. At one time Tiberias boasted of thirteen synagogues, and Jerusalem of four hundred and eighty. The method in the schools, so far as there was any method, was nearly as follows: Questions were asked and answered, opinions stated and discussed, and illustrations proposed in the form of allegories or aphorisms or parables; corresponding, perhaps, as much as to anything modern, to our adult Bible-classes.[2] In the training of boys much responsibility and labour devolved upon the father. The boy was afterward sent to these Bible-class meetings, which constituted the schools of the land, and which existed wherever there was a synagogue. Philo says: "What else are the synagogues than schools of piety and virtue?"[3] Hausrath calls them "the true schools of the nation."[4] Jerusalem, as the metropolis of the nation, would no doubt exert in many respects a dominant influence.[5] The most eminent teachers

instruction among the Jews it must be said that the Talmud is inclined to give too great antiquity to the Rabbinical school-system, which was developed and existed only long after the destruction of Jerusalem, and to make the impression that the systematic public instruction and training of youth prevailed long before Christ. Dr Ginsburg in Art. "Education," in Kitto's *Cyclopædia Bib. Lit.* i. 729, gives altogether too much weight to these statements of the Talmud, and thus, we think, greatly misrepresents the real state of the case at the time of Christ. Another instance in point is the statements of the Talmud in regard to *coins;* see Madden, *Jewish Coinage*, 334 sq.—"Counterfeit Jewish Coins."

[1] Conybeare and Howson, i. 56.

[2] Matt. xxii. 17–22; Luke ii. 46; xx. 2–4; Conybeare and Howson, i. 58.

[3] Edit. Mangey, 1742. vol. ii. 168, 458; Schneckenburger, 108. [4] i. 75.

[5] Schneckenburger, 111; Synagogues in Jerusalem, &c., Lightfoot, i. 78; in Tiberias, *Ibid.* 158; Hausrath, i. 71; in Capernaum, Synagogue and School, Hausrath, i. 73; Synagogues out of Judea, Ant. xvi. 6. 2; vast Synagogue at Tiberias, in which assemblies of people were held in Jewish War, Life, 54; see Hausrath, i. 5 and 295.

would naturally go there, as in the case of Hillel and Gamaliel. But Sepphoris[1] and Tiberias, the capitals in succession of Galilee, would have their eminent teachers as well; whilst every town and village might boast of its learned men —its local Rabbis or Rabbi. How often is it said that Christ went through all the cities and villages of Galilee, teaching in the schools or synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom?[2] Again, on a certain occasion in Capernaum, "there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, who were come out of every town (κώμη) of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem."[3] Sometimes the learned men of the south and the north would visit each other for friendly intercourse, when, according to Keim, they were treated with respect by the people, and given the places of honour in the synagogues.[4] Sometimes the Scribes of the south would visit the north to watch Christ, not to see if the law was fulfilled, but to see if their traditions were violated.[5] The Talmud charges the Galileans with neglecting tradition,[6] and the passages in the Gospels just referred to show that there was some ground for such a charge in Christ's time. Further, this charge, and the visits of the Jerusalem doctors just referred to, both show that while Jerusalem, where were the Temple and the Sanhedrin, exercised a dominant influence in reference to matters of religion, yet the Galileans were in a measure independent in regard to such affairs.[7] A just distinction to make is this, that in Jerusalem were the champions of tradition, and in Galilee the champions of the law.[8] Adherence to the strict letter of the law may be regarded as a prominent characteristic of the learned men of Galilee, in distinction from those of Jerusalem.[9] In Jerusalem novelties were introduced and changes made, according to emergencies, and sometimes licenses allowed in regard

[1] Under Gabinius, in B.C. 56, Sepphoris was the seat of one of the five Sanhedrins established by him, Ant. xiv. 5. 4.; Wars, i. 8. 5; in the time of the War, the council (βουλή) of Tiberias numbered six hundred members, Wars, ii. 21. 9; Galilee had also its own arsenals, treasury, and archives, Life, ix.; Wars, ii. 4. 1.

[2] Matt. ix. 35, and many other places; Hausrath, i. 388. [3] Luke v. 17.

[4] Luke v. 17; Keim, i. 314, and refs.; also, Hausrath, i. 78.

[5] Matt. xv. 1 sq.; Mark vii. 1, et sq. [6] Neubauer, 183.

[7] Dominant influence of Jerusalem, see Schneckenburger, 111.

[8] Geiger, Wrschrift, 155.

[9] Matt. v. 17, 18; Neubauer, 184; Graetz, iii. 394.

to religious and other usages, which would not be tolerated in Galilee.[1] If we may refer to Christ, in this connection, perhaps the remarks just made will be illustrated by His wonderful familiarity with the Scriptures, His great regard for the law, and His contempt for tradition. The Scribes and learned men of Galilee, so far as we can judge, were familiar with the law; worship in the synagogues was strictly maintained; and there appears to have existed here a freer and healthier religious life than in the south. Among the different sects in Jerusalem Christ met with an atmosphere that was cheerless and dismal. In the freer north, far away from the bleak home of priests and Levites, there was a people less under the influence of the "straiter" sects, less hardened and narrowed by the dogmatic systems which prevailed in the holy city;[2] among which people Christ for the most part found a welcome. Without seeking to draw too sharp a line of distinction between the people of Galilee and those of Judea, it is no doubt true that the former lacked the narrow prejudices of the latter towards the people of other nations; for, to mention a single instance, it is a worthy son of the north who, at Joppa, in a wonderful vision, first learns and teaches to his countrymen that great lesson of the Master, that the Gentiles as well as themselves, may share in the new gospel of the grace of God.[3] And, in general, the influences in Galilee tended to develope and enlarge the national mind and character, while those in Judea tended to contract and dwarf the same. The peasants and shepherds on the rather poor uplands of Judea are spoken of as ignorant and narrow[4]—the slavish tools of the priesthood of Jerusalem——the fuel easily kindled into "uproars of the people."[5] In regard to the violation of the laws pertaining to marriage, public sentiment seems to have been a unit throughout the land.[6] Also, that morbid sensitiveness of the Jews in

[1] Neubauer, 184, 186, and note. [2] Hausrath, i. 10; Keim, i. 315.

[3] Acts x.

[4] Hausrath, i. 40. See case where brigands "drag a rustic from the country," who "scarcely knew what the high-priesthood meant," for the purpose of making him high-priest, Wars, iv. 3. 8.

[5] Matt. xxvi. 5.

[6] See case of Antipas and John the Baptist. Their custom a singular one: a man who did not marry a deceased brother's widow in case there were no children, was a criminal; but such marriage, in case there were children, was itself criminal! Again, a man might divorce his wife; but if a wife divorced

regard to images and statues was shared in by the people of the whole country alike.[1] Several particulars, however, are mentioned in regard to morals and certain other things, which show a greater degree of strictness in Galilee than in Judea. For instance, the great care of the Galileans was for reputation, while the Judeans cared less for reputation and more for money. Also, as to labouring on Passover eves, some synagogual rites, devoting goods directly to God, and not to the priests, funeral customs, provision for widows, marriages being celebrated with decorum, a spirit of charity or benevolence, and as to regulations in regard to the intercourse of persons betrothed—in all those respects, greater strictness is conceded to the Galileans.[2]

That the Galileans "manifested less zeal for the religion of Moses" than the people of the south, we have shewn to be incorrect. Rather the contrary was true. The statement that they imbibed all sorts of superstitions from their heathen neighbours, as "possession of devils," and the like, has not the slightest evidence in its support, either in Josephus or the New Testament. The statement stands as an assertion without proof. As to "means for disseminating a knowledge of the law," Galilee was as well provided as Judea; aside, perhaps, from eminent teachers in Jerusalem, with whom, however, it is not possible that all the learned men of Christ's time could have studied. Still, it is said that they were less "sensitive to heathen influences,"[3] and that a "heathen city like Tiberias would not have been tolerated in Judea."[4] The facts will not justify these assertions. There were theatres

her husband, it was a public abomination! Herodias divorced herself from Herod Philip (*not* the Tetrarch), "confounding the laws of our country," Ant. xviii. 5. 4. Archelaus also scandalised the nation by marrying his brother's widow, *when she had children by her first husband!* Ant. xvii. 13. 1.

[1] Ant. xv. 8. 1. 2. See Prideaux, Connection, ii. 384, 385. People of Tiberias when Caius wanted his statue put up in the Temple, Ant. xviii. 8. 3, 4, "stretched out their throats, and were ready to die;" "left off tilling the ground;" and "the land remained unsown," &c., Wars, ii. 10. 5. See case of Vitellius marching under orders from Tiberius to help Antipas against Aretas, king of Arabia, Ant. xviii. 5. 3; Keim's inference from this fact is hardly correct, i. 316.

[2] Lightfoot, i. 169, and refs. to Talmud; Neubauer, 181–183, and refs. to Talmud: see also p. 286; Graetz, iii. 394; Delitzsch, Handwerkerleben, 40. This fact in regard to betrothed persons Delitzsch makes illustrate the surprise of the disciples when Christ talked with the woman at the well, *ibid.*

[3] Hausrath, i. 10. [4] Th., i. 11.

and amphitheatres in many of the large cities of the country. In the splendid theatre and the vast amphitheatre at Jerusalem were enacted all the games that were known in Italy or Greece, while Tiberias, so far as we know, had only a stadium or race-course.[1] If by being "less sensitive to heathen influences" is meant that, apart from religious ideas, the commercial and social ideas of the Galileans were broadened and benefited by their intercourse with surrounding nations, then the statement is true. Such a result was produced by that intercourse. As to the influence of the morals of the rulers on those of the people, there are but few data from which to judge. Alexandra, Hyrcanus's daughter, seems to have been destitute of principle in her attempt to administer by her beautiful children, Aristobulus and Mariamne, to the lust of Antony, of whom she wanted some favour.[2] As to Herod the Great, whatever else may have been his crimes, he could never be charged with either lust or intemperance. Herod Philip was a man of whose morals no ill could be said. Archelaus's reign was short. Under the Romans, from 7 A.D. to 66, Judea, as we have seen, suffered in every way. Herod Antipas was neither lustful nor intemperate. His act in marrying Herodias (a violation of the law, because she had a child by her first husband, Antipas's brother) was universally condemned, and by no means imitated by his subjects. To the credit of both Herodias and Antipas, it should be said that they loved each other truly, and when Antipas was banished, and Herodias might have lived in ease at Rome or Judea, she chose to follow her husband into exile,[3]—an act which, if people were not prejudiced against her, would be spoken of as noble.

In addition to what has been said, we are to consider: 1. That Christ was, as a rule, well received in Galilee; 2. That John the Baptist had here a strong party of adherents; 3. That this was the home of Judas, the founder of the sect of

[1] At Jerusalem, Ant. xv. 8. 1; xix. 7. 4; Hippodrome in Tarichaea, Wars, ii. 21. 8; Life, 27, 28; Theatre in Scythopolis, Ritter, ii. 334; Gadara, Ritter, ii. 303; Our Work in Palestine, 194, 195; at Berytus, Ant. xix. 7. 5, also "amphitheatres," "baths," "porticos;" at Cesarea, theatre and amphitheatre, Ant. xv. 9. 6; difference between theatre and amphitheatre, see Traill's Josephus, 1. xxxvii. In regard to Antipas's palace at Tiberias, if it was hateful to the stricter Jews, why did they wait from his removal in A.D. 39 to A.D. 66, before they took any measures to destroy it? See Life, 12.

[2] Ant. xv. 2. 6. [3] Ib., xviii. 7. 2.

the Galileans.[1] This man's moral character cannot be impugned; he was a Puritan of the strictest school; the platform of his sect or party looked well on paper,—a grand idea about which to rally,—but it was thoroughly impracticable in those unfortunate times; 4. That this was the home, also, of Eleazar, the missionary to Adiabene and the court of Izates. This man "was very skilful in the learning of his country." His words, "not only to read the law, but to practise it," represent the thorough style of his teaching. He seems to have been zealous, familiar with the law, skilful and eloquent in presenting his views, and perhaps we have a right to regard him as a representative man of Galilee.[2] Again, we hold the opinion that the Sermon on the Mount, whether regarded as one discourse or as the substance of many discourses, could not have been preached in Judea,—at the beginning of Christ's ministry, at least,—considering the fact that Jerusalem was the hot-bed of tradition, and considering, also, the excited state of the public mind there, wild as it was with dreams of the coming Messiah. The sermon presupposes the ability, and also a willingness, on the part of the listeners, to look beyond tradition and the mere letter of the law, to a somewhat new and enlarged application of old sayings and truths. Such a state of mind would not be looked for in Judea at that time; but we should expect that in the region of Capernaum.[3]

XIV. *The Poetical Talent finely developed among the Galileans.*—Besides the physical and moral vigour of this people,

[1] Mentioned in the New Testament only in Acts v. 37; his rallying theme was, that God alone was master, Ant. xviii. 1. 6; paying tribute to the Romans was slavery; they were "not to bow to mortals as their masters," Ant. xviii. 1. 1; Wars, ii. 8. 1; Graetz, Sinai et Golgotha (French tr.), Paris, 1867, p. 267, says of this Judas that "in consequence of his life and deeds the masters of the world had so much more trouble to subdue the small Jewish people than they had to subdue the great nations of Europe." Judas must have founded his sect in Jerusalem. The "census" in which he figured had nothing to do with Galilee. Herod Philip and Herod Antipas both settled the affairs of their respective provinces irrespective of Rome, Ant. xviii. 2. 1. Judas proclaimed his doctrines and founded his sect in Jerusalem.

[2] Ant. xx. 2. 4; Keim, ii. 314; Graetz, iii. 334.

[3] On the general character of the people of Judea, as distinguished from those of Galilee, and how easily they were misled by false Messiahs—strange proceedings such as were never reported from Galilee—see passage in Hausrath, i. 41, 42. It would have been difficult for Christ to have planted himself in Judea.

we discover, also, an elasticity and freshness of spirit which did not prevail among the people of the south. On this account it was, perhaps, that here the poetical talent was so finely developed. We have already quoted the statement that "if nature could influence mind, if it could create genius, Naphtali would be a land of poets."[1] "The vine-covered slopes, the plains brilliant with flowers, the wooded glens and knolls, sparkling with springs," the beautiful lake deep within the bosom of the hills, the distant but ever visible "great sea" —symbol of the Infinite—would all contribute to awaken and stimulate the richest, and perhaps grandest, spirit of poetry.[2] One of the earliest triumph-songs of Israel, as well as one of the noblest, sounded forth from the hills of Galilee on the occasion of Barak's victory over the Canaanites in the plain of Jezreel. And, if we were to adopt the view held by many eminent scholars, the Song of Songs had also its origin among these beautiful scenes of nature—the music of a heart about which earth and sky had lavished their charms—the song of one whose eyes delighted in beholding the beauty of the flowers and the richness of the fig-tree, the olive, and the vine.[3]

XV. *The Prophets, Judges, and other famous Men of Galilee.*—In this connection, a brief notice must be taken of the famous persons whose birth-place, or home, was in this northern province. We may be obliged here to go beyond the strict limits of our period, in order to answer the flippant and prejudiced remark, "Out of Galilee arises no prophet"[4] —a remark which should never have been believed at all, but which, being accepted without reflection, has had much influence in shaping the common notion of the character of Galilee. In the time of the Judges, Naphtali furnished Barak, the victor over the Canaanites, with whom should be mentioned Deborah, "a prophetess," "the mother in Israel," whose presence and words inspired those bold sons of the north to heroic deeds, and also Jael, "the wife of Heber the Kenite," a heroine of that bloody day.[5] Zebulon furnished Ibzan, who judged

[1] Porter, Bashan, 263. [2] See Isaac Taylor, Hebrew Poetry, 73.
[3] See Hausrath, i. 12. Gesenius and others hold this view. [4] John vii. 52.
[5] On these characters, see Ewald, Hist. Isr. ii. 374–379. Deborah and Barak, "whose valour delivered the nation from a vassalage of twenty years" to Jabin, king of Hazor, Ritter, ii. 225; Barak, Judg. iv.; Jael, Judg. iv. 17; Deborah judged Israel at this time, Judg. iv. 4.

Israel seven years,[1] and after him
for ten years.[2] Still later this c
ber of prophets, whose memorie
by the people, and whose tombs w
a grateful posterity with pious care.
Elijah was born in Galilee, yet th
chiefly this northern region, and
Elisha was in the tribe of Issachar
Issachar; Jonah, the son of Amitta
in Zebulon; and the prophet Nahu
In the Assyrian captivity, under S
from Naphtali. He was "a godly
of him we have a very instructive
his times."[4] Alexander, the first re
in Alexandria,—a peripatetic and t
supposed by some to have been
learned doctor of the Mishna, c
other Mishna doctors also came f
Alexander Jannaeus, son of Hyrcan
land.[7] In Christ's time, Anna th
Asher, and, we may mention again,
Judas the Galilean zealot, and with

[1] He was of Bethlehem in Zebulon, Judg.

[2] Judg. xii. 11; Issachar furnished also
twenty-three years," Judg. x. 1, 2; see E
Ibzan, see Keil, Com. on Judg. xii. 8.

[3] This last statement has been disputed;
view expressed in the text; see Smith's Dic

[4] Ritter, iv. 340; Keim, i. 317; Tobit, i.

[5] Keim, i. 317, is inclined to adopt thi
Herzfeld, Gesth. des Volkes Isr. iii. 473; E
Aristobulus Heinichen's ed. of Euseb. Hist
420, note 22, an important note. That
made very doubtful. Graetz, iii. 40, 50,
gions-Philos. (ed. Halle, 1834), ii. 73 et seq.

[6] ניתאי הארבלי. Ginsburg, Kitto's Cyc
B.C. 140–110. See Neubauer, 219; Chiarini,
"lived towards the year 200 B.C." For t
Galilee, see Chiarini, *ibid.* p. 106. No. 15,
iii. 107 for Nitai's rule of life: "Avoid a b
sinners; and do not forget a future recomp

[7] Ant. xiii. 12. 1; as soon as he was bor
brought up there, because his father took su
317.

Simon, and Manahem.[1] Perhaps Hezekiah, the brigand chief whom Herod slew, and his son Judas, who on Herod's death raised a revolt, and took Sepphoris, and was captured only after a hard struggle, may be mentioned as shewing, though outlaws, the metal of the Galileans.[2] There was also Eleazar, the son of Jairus, a kinsman of Manahem, and a descendant of Judas the zealot, just mentioned, and who was the founder of the sect of the Galileans. This Eleazar boasted of himself and his companions: "We were the first of all to revolt" against the Romans, "and we are the last in arms against them;" "We determined to serve as master no one but God, and the time has come for us to shew the sincerity of our words by our actions;" and they all perished then and there, in the bloody slaughter of Masada.[3] Galilee had Herod the Great for governor, and after Antipas, the ablest of his sons, and still later, as military governor, Josephus. At that time flourished the famous John of Gischala; also, Silas, the governor of Tiberias by Josephus's appointment, and Joshua, in authority there, but opposed to Josephus; also, Julius Capellus, leader of the most respectable party in Tiberias, and his associates, namely, Herod son of Miarus, Herod son of Gamalus, Compsus and Crispus—these two the sons of Compsus; also, Pistus and his son Justus—the latter a friend of Greek learning, and the author of a history in Greek of his own times, but the implacable enemy of Josephus. Other names are given in the note.[4] We might, perhaps, include Nathanael of Cana of Galilee;

[1] James and Simon crucified, Ant. xx. v. 2; Manahem killed in Jerusalem, Wars, ii. 17. 9.

[2] Wars, ii. 4. 1.

[3] Wars, ii. 17. 9; vii. 8. 6; Graetz, iii. 452, makes him a descendant of Judas the Zealot.

[4] Dassion and Jannaeus, leading persons in Tiberias; Joshua and Jeremiah employed by Josephus; Joseph, "a turbulent person of Gamala;" see Life, 9; Traill's Joseph. i. 27, "Designation of the persons mentioned in the Life of Josephus;" Keim, i. 317, 318; Graetz, iii. 397; Simon, "the leading person in Gabara," and the friend of John of Gischala, Life, 25; Aeneas, "the person of greatest influence in Tarichaea," and the friend of Josephus, Wars, ii. 21. 3; also a woman is mentioned, a relative of Eleazar (of Massada fame), "in understanding and education superior to most of her sex," Wars, vii. 9. 1; Keim, i. 427. There was in the early church a tradition that the parents of the Apostle Paul came from Gischala (see Arnaud, 577) in Galilee. It is given by Jerome (refs. in Arnaud, 577; Robinson, ii. 446). It is easy to reject the tradition; but quite difficult to see how such a tradition should become attached to this particular place; somebody at some time must have believed it, and perhaps with reasons.

Peter, as a representative man of Galilee;[1] Zebedee and his two sons, James and John—a family of wealth; Andrew and Philip, of Bethsaida in Galilee; Joseph and Mary; James, the brother of Christ and the first bishop of Jerusalem; also Salome, sister of Mary and wife of Zebedee.

And if we were to look beyond the destruction of Jerusalem, we should find Galilee the abode of many famous and learned men, and the seat of flourishing schools. From the second to the sixth century Galilee was the chief seat of Jewish learning.[2]

XVI. *The Wealth and Material Prosperity of the Province.* —Of the wealth and material prosperity of Galilee it is difficult to speak, apart from the connection of this topic with the whole country. Of the wealth and prosperity of the whole country during the period covered by the reign of Herod the Great and the life of Christ very much might be said. The Jews throughout the world were a wealthy class. In wealth, as well as in numbers, they surpassed the Greeks in Cesarea.[3] Those in Parthia, on the Euphrates, were rich.[4] Strabo, as quoted by Josephus, remarks upon their wealth and prosperity "in every city in the habitable earth."[5] In Crete, Melos, and Rome, their wealth is spoken of.[6] Vast sums from all parts of the world flowed into the Temple at Jerusalem. In B.C. 54 Crassus took from the Temple upwards of ten thousand talents in gold and silver, and one huge ingot of gold besides.[7] In several other instances, the Temple was robbed by the grasping Roman governors or generals. Herod the Great was one of the best financiers the world has ever seen. He was always ready with money or provisions, in case any one was in need. He was a capital provider for his own family and kingdom. Measuring his revenue by his expenses, his kingdom must have been managed with great ability to have yielded so much. He was never in debt, always remarkably prompt in his payments, frequently assisting others who were in need of money; and

[1] Keim, i. 315. See fine passage on the men of Galilee in Stanley; Jewish Church, ii. 300; also, *ibid.* 308 and 413 for notice of Tobit.

[2] Keim, i. 818.

NOTE.—Graetz, on all occasions, takes decidedly the ground of John of Gischala as against Josephus, iii. 396; against Josephus he is always very bitter. This feeling sometimes warps his judgment of facts.

[3] Wars, ii. 13. 7; Ant. xx. 8. 7. [4] Ant. xv. 2. 4. [5] Ant. xiv. 7. 2.

[6] Wars, ii. 7. 1; See Milman, ii. 20. [7] Ant. xiv. 7. 1; Wars, i. 8. 8.

from the outset of his governorship of Galilee, at the age of twenty-five, to his death, was constantly making valuable presents to various cities or persons.[1]

But we must confine our attention to Galilee. Its material prosperity has been hinted at in our notice of the industries of the province. Its numerous and flourishing cities and villages —some of which were elegantly built—indicate the very opposite of poverty and limited means. The "opulent" citizens of Gischala are spoken of.[2] John of Gischala was a man of wealth, and unusually shrewd and capable in business.[3] The people of Sepphoris are spoken of as possessed of "ample means."[4] The tithes collected in Galilee are mentioned as amounting to "a large sum of money."[5] The treasure stored in the palace of Antipas at Tiberias was a large amount, and the furnishings of the palace were astonishingly rich and elegant.[6] Several times Galilee had to support a portion of the Roman army in winter quarters.[7] The Talmud mentions three cities of Galilee which had "sent enormous treasures to Jerusalem—Sichin, Caboul, and Magdala."[8] Zebedee, it is supposed, was a man of wealth and influence.[9] Capernaum, as a centre of news, business, and commerce, was a place of luxury. It is a significant fact that Christ chose this very city as His residence.[10] The fact that Christ was called a "gluttonous man and a wine-bibber" shews that a style of living prevailed here which was distasteful to certain ascetics of the time.[11] Perhaps, in Christ's reproach of Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum, there may be a hint as to the wealth and luxury and consequent worldli-

[1] The bier and bed and other furnishings at Herod's funeral indicate great wealth, Wars, i. 33. 9; compare Wars, ii. 1. 1. The great wealth of King Agrippa I. is spoken of, Wars, ii. 116; men went to Judea for adventure and speculation, Wars, i. 26. 1; rich articles of gold and silver, and costly carpets, and vestments were sometimes bought in Rome for Judea, Wars, i. 31. 2. The Romans in general had exaggerated ideas of the wealth of Judea; it was to them a sort of gold mine; just the place for greedy Roman politicians.

[2] Wars, ii. 21. 2. [3] Wars, ii. 20; ii. 21. 2. [4] Wars, ii. 20. 6.

[5] Life, 12. [6] Life, 12. 13.

[7] Under Silo, Ant., xiv. 15. 3; Wars, i. 15. 6; under Vespasian, Wars, iv. 2. 1, in Scythopolis, and in other cases.

[8] Neubauer, 217, and refs.

[9] Smith's Dict. Bib., ii. 1420, col. 2, Art., "John the Apostle."

[10] Keim, i. 597.

[11] Matt. xi. 19; *φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης*, Luke vii. 34; see Matt. xi. 10; Hausrath, i. 352.

ness of these places.[1] Along their "way of the sea" the rich fabrics, spices, and other products of Babylon, and farther Asia would be carried, on their way to Egypt or Rome, by rich merchants, seeking goodly pearls.[2] Galilee would be benefited by the traffic carried on at the trading stations along this route of commerce.[3] The contribution sent from Antioch, in A.D. 44, was for the brethren in Judea, or perhaps for "the poor saints in Jerusalem," as if no assistance was needed by the brethren in Galilee.[4] In B.C. 43, four years after Herod was appointed Governor of Galilee, Cassius came into Syria for the purpose of raising men and money. For the latter object there was, in his view, no richer gold-mine than Judea. The enormous sum which Crassus (B.C. 54) had taken from the Temple at Jerusalem convinced him of that.[5] He imposed a tribute on Judea (the whole province) of seven hundred talents (7000? See note). Antipater (Herod the Great's father) distributes this among several persons, that it may be raised with all possible dispatch.[6] Herod, as governor of Galilee, was the first to bring in his share, which was one hundred talents, and thus he gained the favour of Cassius, who bestowed upon him the governorship of Coelo-Syria.[7]

As to mines, in Judea, as distinguished from Galilee

[1] Keim, i. 597, who states the matter strongly; Matt. xi. 2-24.

[2] Matt. xiii. 45, 46; Hausrath, i. 351.

[3] Trading stations, see Ewald, Hist. Isr., iii. 261, and 216 note; Capernaum was an important station, and had partly by this means become a place of luxury.

[4] Acts xi. 29; Rom. xv. 26.

[5] Graetz, iii. 185.

[6] Wars, i. 11. 2. The amount named in Josephus, 700 talents, seems small measured by other sums which were raised at other times, and by the great distress caused by forcing the collection of this money. Cassius needed money. He had wild ideas of the wealth of the country. Certain sections are slow in making their payments, and four cities are reduced to slavery, which alone, on any reasonable computation, would yield a sum equal to, or greater than the whole amount required; cities reduced to slavery were Lydda, Thamna, Gophna, and Emmaus, Ant. xiv. 11. 2; Wars, i. 11. 2; Cassius has pressing need of money, Ant., xiv. 11. 2. Herod, after being made King, subdues the robbers in Galilee, and upon the few places which they occupied levies a tribute of 100 talents for their good behaviour, Ant., xiv. 15. 6. We conclude that Cassius was not so urgent for money as is represented, and consequently his levy was small, or else that the text should read 7000 instead of 700, as at present. Whiston, in his Josephus, has a note on this point, Wars, i. 11. 2.

[7] Ant., xiv. 11. 4.

and Samaria, there were none. The "iron mountain" of Josephus was east of the Jordan.[1] Extensive copper-mines are found in the Sinaitic peninsula. Traces of a mine have been found on the south border of Galilee. The north part of Galilee, at least the Lebanon region, was rich in mines. The copper-mines of Cyprus were extensive, and Herod got half the revenue from them and the care of the other half.[2] And if his honesty had not exceeded the honesty of some modern public men, there would have been little revenue left for the Roman government.

XVII. *Was Galilee regarded with Contempt by the People of Jerusalem, as is so often alleged?*—There is a very general impression that the Jews of Jerusalem regarded with contempt the people of Galilee, and even the province itself. And of this contempt Nazareth received perhaps the largest share. Supposing such contempt to have existed, all that we have hitherto said is a protest against the justice of it. In its climate, its fertile soil, and its charming scenery; in the abundance of its waters and the beauty of its lakes; in its numerous and often elegant cities and villages; in its hardy, industrious, and intelligent population; in the interest of its people in the law, in the Temple and its services, in the great national feasts, and in the general welfare of the nation; in its wealth and material prosperity, its various thriving industries, and in the unexampled patriotism and bravery of its sons,—what ground is there why the people of Jerusalem should regard Galilee or the Galileans with contempt? In order to show how universally it is taken for granted that this feeling existed, it is necessary to quote a few statements; including now Nazareth with Galilee: "Peter was a Galilean fisherman, brought up in the rudest district of an obscure province."[3] "In this despised region, his home [Nazareth] was the most despised spot."[4] "An obscure village of despised

[1] Wars, iv. 8. 2. See Ewald, Hist. Isr., iv. 192, and refs. to Old Testament; Lightfoot, i. 189; Ritter, ii. 189; Smith's Dict. Bib. iii. 1911, col. 1, Art. "Metals," speaks of mines still worked in the Lebanon region; see *ibid.*, Art. "Mines," p. 1937. See passage, too long to quote, on the metals and minerals of the Lebanon region in Capt. Burton's Unexplored Syria; also, vol. ii. 27; see Arnaud, 368 sq.

[2] Ant. xvi. 4. 5.

[3] Conybeare and Howson, St Paul, i. 115.

[4] Delitzsch, Jesus u. Hillel, p. 13.

Galilee,"[1]—when the very Greek text which Dr Wordsworth was editing says, "city" (πόλις, not κώμη)! "The roughness of its population." "Nazareth, an outlying village," which "had a bad reputation," whose people were of "a somewhat depraved type."[3] "To be known to belong to that country was of itself sufficient to prejudice Pilate against him"[4] (entirely gratuitous; Pilate was Christ's friend). "The very villagers themselves spoke with a rude and uncouth provincialism that marked them at once as Nazarenes."[5] (The dialect of any person from Nazareth is never alluded to; Peter, certainly, was not from Nazareth; on what possible ground is the statement just quoted based?) "That obscure Galilean village."[6] One who went from the Sea of Galilee to Judea "war ein Stichblatt des Witzes der dortigen Stammgenossen."[7] (How does Hausrath know that such a person became "a butt of ridicule"?) "A little country town of proverbial insignificance," "the darkest district of Palestine."[8] "The old scorn which rested upon the Galileans in Joshua's day."[9] These statements show the popular impression and teaching in regard to Galilee and Nazareth. And further, in regard to the "poverty" and "abject meanness" of Christ's earthly condition, and the nearly "destitute circumstances" of Joseph and Mary, and the "ignorance" and even "immorality" of the people of Nazareth, we read a great deal in books, and hear by far too much in sermons from the pulpit.[10] Abundance of quotations to this effect could be given, if necessary. But are these representations true? These statements, appearing everywhere, and so sweeping and positive withal, ought to have some foundation, for which we propose to look. First, as to the contempt for the Galileans on the ground of dialect, or difference of pronunciation. The passages in both Talmuds

[1] Wordsworth, Com. on Matt. ii. 23.
[2] Stanley, S. and P. 358.
[3] Stoppford A. Brooke, Sermons (Boston ed. 1869), p. 120.
[4] McClintock and Strong, Cyclopædia, iii. 717, col. 1. Art. "Galilean."
[5] Recovery of Jerusalem, p. 354, in paper by Lieut. Anderson, R.E.
[6] Plumptre, Christ and Christendom, 95.
[7] Hausrath, i. 11.
[8] Schaff, Person of Christ, 34.
[9] Ritter, iv. 332.
[10] See a frightfully distressing picture of Christ's circumstances in early life, and during his earthly life in general, in Isaac Barrow's Sermon on Patience; Text 1 Pet. ii. 21, in vol. i. p. 467 (New York ed. 1845). Dr Schaff, in the place just noticed, is bad enough. Meyer, Com. on John i. 47, makes ἀγαθός imply *immorality*!

referring to this point are but few in number. Buxtorf, Lightfoot, and Neubauer refer to the same passages. We have noticed that in all matters relating to Palestine the Jerusalem Talmud seems to be the most consistent and reliable. We should expect this, from the fact that it was compiled earlier than the other, and written in the country itself.[1] In this Talmud, this whole matter of dialect is reduced to the simple statement that the doctors (of Judea) did not distinguish between *He* and *Cheth*, nor between *Aleph* and *Ayin*—this simple statement, without comment. The Babylonian Talmud has the same. But the latter (completed about A.D. 500) has, in addition, several amusing stories illustrating the peculiar pronunciation of the Galileans. The late date of the compilation of this work would damage its evidence. Where the Jerusalem Talmud is silent, the later Babylonian Talmud cannot be brought forward to shew that the Jews of Jerusalem treated with contempt or ridicule their brethren of Galilee on the ground of the pronunciation of the latter. It is a very significant fact that St Jerome (331–422) considered himself peculiarly fortunate in obtaining a Hebrew teacher from Tiberias, because there Hebrew was spoken with such purity.[2] After thus collecting the facts, it looks as if the doctors in the schools of the East invented certain stories in regard to the pronunciation of the Galileans (and the Judeans as well) by which to amuse themselves or their pupils at the expense of their brethren in Palestine.[3]

The dialect of Galilee is referred to but once in the New Testament, namely, in connection with Peter at the trial of Christ. Of this event there are four accounts.[4] The "speech,"

[1] 350–400 A.D.

[2] See Gfrörer, 117; Ritter, ii. 258; Robinson, ii. 391, and note.

Note on the difference of the two Talmuds here referred to: "Frankel shews that the Babylonian Talmud injures the more correct ideas contained in the Jerusalem Talmud by many unwarranted additions and inexact statements, and has given examples in different places of his new Monatschrift." —"Steinschneider's Jewish Literature (Eng. Tr. London, 1857), p. 273.

[3] Lightfoot, i. 170–172; Graetz, iii. 395; Neubauer, 184, 185; Buxtorf, Lexicon, 224, 225, Art. גְּלִיל; Renan, Lang. Semitiques, 230 (his only authorities are, however, Lightfoot, Buxtorf, Fürst, Dukes, and Ewald). No blame to Renan, however, for the authorities can be reduced to a very few hints in the Talmud.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 69–75; Mark xiv. 66–72; Luke xxii. 54–62; John xviii. 25–27.

or peculiar pronunciation of Peter is mentioned by Matthew only,[1] for the words "and thy speech agreeth" in Mark xiv. 70, are to be omitted. It is often alleged that Peter's "speech" was alluded to by way of contempt. This passage and the one in Mark are the only evidence which Hausrath produces to prove his assertion that "a man from the Sea of Galilee became in Judea," on account of his pronunciation, "a butt of ridicule."[2] But no contempt was here either expressed or implied. Peter had denied a certain statement, and the bystanders, to justify themselves, without any thought of ridicule or contempt, said simply, "Your speech reveals you to be a Galilean," as we have alleged.[3] Sometimes Acts ii. 7 is referred to as supporting the view stated above. But there could hardly be a more unjust use of the passage. The point of surprise on the part of the audience was, that so few men, all coming from the same region, should speak all the languages of the world. The surprise would have been great if the speakers had all come from either Greece, Italy, or Babylon. In this case they were from Galilee. But nothing can be inferred from this passage which is in any way derogatory to the character of the Galileans. Besides the above, there are no other passages in the New Testament which bear upon the matter of the dialect of Galilee. On this point Josephus is silent—a significant fact. Thus, neither in Josephus, the New Testament, nor the Talmud, is there any ground, as regards dialect, why the people of Jerusalem should regard with contempt the people of Galilee; nor is there the slightest evidence that, *on this ground*, the people of Jerusalem regarded the people of Galilee with any such feeling at all. Yet this matter of dialect is one of the strongest arguments held up before the popular mind to prove the existence of this alleged feeling of contempt. Further, what a splendid instrument this matter of dialect would have been in the hands of the enemies of Christ, to be used against Him and His disciples! If this difference of dialect was the occasion of any feeling between the people of the two sections, if on this account the Galileans were really laughing-stocks in Jerusalem, then what stupidity on the part of Christ's enemies not to have used this most effective means

[1] Matt. xxvi. 73. [2] Hausrath, 11.

[3] Καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ, Matt. xxvi. 73.

for silencing Him and counteracting His influence. The silence of Christ's enemies is a strong argument against the supposition that *on the ground of dialect* there existed among the Jews of Jerusalem a feeling of contempt for the Galileans. Another alleged ground is the "religious looseness" which is supposed to have prevailed in Galilee.[1] But we have seen that the Galileans were stricter in regard to morals than the people of Judea, and that the former adhered more closely to the law than the latter, while the latter put *tradition* foremost. These facts speak for themselves. Another ground is, that the people of the north were a mixed race.[2] We have shewn that they are to be regarded as thoroughly Jewish. Another, because the Galileans would not be dictated to by the Doctors of Jerusalem.[3] If this, in so far as it is fact at all, occasioned any feeling, it nowhere appears, or is even hinted at. Again, Keim makes the circumstance that John Hyrcanus sent his son Alexander Jannaeus, the subsequent king, to Galilee to be brought up, imply his contempt for Galilee.[4] Whereas the only point in this fact is, that Hyrcanus wanted his son out of his sight—in Galilee, or anywhere else, where he would not see him again. Again, Keim presses another fact altogether too far, when he says that "Antipater regarded his younger son, the youngster Herod [but he was then twenty-five!] *as smart enough*—für tüchtig genug—to govern Galilee," implying the very opposite of what the facts indicate as given by Josephus.[5] Herod was sent to Galilee because, of the two sons of Antipater, he was the more shrewd, active, and capable. Delitzsch states the popular view as if it were a firmly established fact, instead of being, as it really is, a supposition with hardly a shadow of proof: his words are, "The Judeans regarded the Galileans with proud contempt, just as the Greeks regarded the Bœotians, or the Parisians the people of Gascogne:"[6] which

[1] Hausrath, i. 11; Keim, i. 310.

[2] Hausrath, i. 8. 9; Schneckenburger, 114.

[3] Keim, i. 310.

[4] Keim, i. 310.

[5] Ib., i. 310.

[6] Jesus und Hillel, p. 13. We could help Delitzsch by pointing out to him a remark of the brilliant Heine—applicable to Delitzsch's view—a remark in regard to France: "By France I mean Paris; for what the provinces think is of no more importance than the opinions of a man's legs. The head is the seat of thought."—H. Heine's De l'Allemagne, Paris. 2 vols. 8vo. 1835. Preface, p. 12.

we are ready to admit as soon as any evidence can be adduced in support of it. The Christians are once called "the sect of the Nazarenes," and alluded to as such in one other instance;[1] as a sect obnoxious to the Jews; but in neither case is any contempt implied for Galilee or Nazareth. In John vii. 41 all that is meant is that the people universally expected Christ to come from Bethlehem, and not from Galilee. As to the statement in John vii. 52, it is possible that the speakers referred to *the* prophet alluded to in ver. 40, and also in chap. vi. 14.[2] But if they really meant that no prophet ever came from Galilee, they stated what they knew to be false,—that is, supposing that they possessed even the commonest knowledge of their own history. There are, besides the above, no other passage in the New Testament which bear at all upon our subject, except John i. 45, Nathanael's words, which will be considered later.

The grounds mentioned above, on which it is claimed by some that a feeling of contempt for the Galileans was based, are all suppositions of later times. We can readily imagine that, on the part of Jerusalem and its inhabitants, there was a feeling of superiority to Galilee and the Galileans. But that such a feeling (of the existence of which at all we have no proof) ever amounted to contempt, or even to sectional jealousy or prejudice, there is not the slightest evidence in either of the great authorities,—namely, the New Testament, Josephus, and the Talmud. Yet, if such a feeling really existed, it must have appeared somewhere. On this point, the following summary of facts will be significant: 1. On a certain occasion of distress in the northern province, mentioned in 1 Mac. v. 14–23, the Maccabees, though belonging to the tribe of Judah, rallied nobly for the defence of the Galileans—their brethren of the north. There is no trace of sectional feeling here. 2. In A.D. 51 the Galileans were attacked at Ginaea by the Samaritans, while the former were on their way to a feast at Jerusalem. "When the assassination was reported at Jerusalem, the populace were thrown into a state of confusion, and, deserting the festival, hurried to Samaria," to revenge the outrage committed against their brethren of the north.[3] Here is the very opposite of sectional

[1] Acts xxiv. 5; xxviii. 22.
[2] Jahn, Bib. Arch. p. 25. sec. 22.
[3] Wars, ii. 12. 3. 4.

feeling between Judea and Galilee. 3. Had such a feeling existed, it would have cropped out at the great feasts, the common occasions for the display of ill-feeling or mad passions, if any existed, towards any person or party. But a friendly feeling always appears; for, 4. At the outbreak at Pentecost (May 31, in 4 B.C.) after the death of Herod, Galileans, Idumeans, men from Jericho and Perea, join with the Judeans in an attack upon Sabinus and the Roman troops, and apparently there is the greatest harmony among the different sections.[1] 5. During the governorship of Herod, and afterwards during his reign (years from twenty-five to seventy of his life), and during the long reign of Antipas (forty-three years) and the short reign of Agrippa I., and the governorship of Josephus, in all the events which transpired during these years, there is no trace of sectional feeling or jealousy. 6. The opposite of such a feeling is indicated by the visiting back and forth of the Scribes and Pharisees in Christ's time. 7. In the Jewish war, the greatest harmony prevails, for the most part, between Galilee and Judea. 8. The silence of the enemies of Christ. 9. The silence, on this subject, of the New Testament, of Josephus, and of the Talmud. If Galilee was a "despised province," if "the Galileans were looked upon with contempt," ought there not to be hints of such facts *somewhere?*

XVIII. *Nazareth, its Character and probable Size; Origin of the Name; not so isolated as is supposed.*—But in regard to Nazareth, some have apparently felt that they were honouring Christ in proportion as they were able to make his earthly home appear insignificant and mean. The pictures which have been drawn of the "meanness" of Nazareth, and of the "poverty" of Christ's family, are as distressing as they are untruthful. It is a question whether the words of Nathanael have not been misunderstood. The Greek can be translated easily; but we refer to the *spirit* of the words. In common with all the pious at that time, Nathanael expected Christ to appear at Bethlehem.[2] Consequently, any one who should announce that he had appeared elsewhere, would be said at

[1] Ant. xvii. 10. 2; Wars, ii. 3. 1.

[2] The passage in Micah v. 2 (comp. Matt. ii. 6), left no doubt in the minds of the Sanhedrin as to the birth-place of the Messiah," *i.e.* it could occur only at Bethlehem. So Nathanael believed with the rest. See Smith's Dict. Bib. iii. 1907, col. 1. Art. "Messiah."

once to be mistaken. This is a striking case, we think, where too strict adherence to the letter does violence to the sentiments of the speaker and to the well-known facts of the time. Nathanael, in his surprise, said only, "The great good which we expect cannot come from Nazareth, because scripture has declared that he must come from Bethlehem." Thus the words of Nathanael are best explained. Thus, also, we do not make this man whom the lips of the Saviour declared to be "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile," guilty at that very moment of a contemptible spirit of neighbourhood jealousy. Those who infer from the τί ἀγαθόν of Nathanael that Nazareth was an immoral place,[1] found their assumption on a mere fancy, which is supported by not a single fact, and indeed, is contradicted by all we know of the place and people.

Those who claim that Nathanael meant to contrast the insignificance of the place with the greatness of the Messiah[2] (as Alford and others) are equally wrong; for this could have been said of Bethlehem, where He was expected to appear, or, if one chose, of even Jerusalem itself, had he appeared there.

It is often said that Nazareth was not mentioned in the Old Testament, nor in Josephus; implying that hence it must have been an insignificant place. As to Josephus, he mentions only those places which he has occasion to; and out of the two hundred and four cities and villages of Galilee he mentions only about forty. Neither is Capernaum mentioned, either in the Old Testament or the Apocrypha, and but once (perhaps not that) in Josephus. Yet we know it was a place of importance.

As to the origin of the name "Nazareth," no one can decide definitely. At the same time, one explanation may be found to be more probable than any of the others. We reject that which derives it from נָזִיר, *consecrated* or *devoted* to God. Also, that which makes it come from נֹצְרִי, *my Saviour*. Also, the very popular one which Hengstenberg in his Christology labours for, who derives it from נֵצֶר, a *shoot* or *sprout*. But if the word were to contain a reference to the Messiah as a *sprout* or *branch* of David, it should have been some form of צֶמַח, the usual word for "branch," and which is supposed to have direct reference to the Messiah. But the explanation of

[1] Meyer, John, i. 47, on word ἀγαθόν.

[2] Keim, i. 323; Alford on John i. 47.

Hengstenberg (and held by many others) is very improbable; for was it ever heard of to name a place from a certain prophecy, and from a certain word in that prophecy, and that years, and perhaps centuries, before that prophecy was fulfilled? A town could hardly have failed to have existed on so eligible a site from very early times. The hill just back of the present town is spoken of by every one as commanding one of the finest prospects in Palestine. It could not have failed of a name, as well as Hermon, Tabor, or Gilboa.[1] We have long had the impression, confirmed since we stood on the hill itself, that the name of the town and the hill must be intimately connected, or perhaps identical. If we had the name of the latter, we should know that of the former. We have already shewn that to the New Testament writers this place was a πόλις, and never a κώμη, and hence of size and importance, in spite of modern commentaries and sermons, which insist on its insignificance. Keim puts the probable number of its inhabitants at "ten thousand souls at least."[2] But if we receive the statement of Josephus, before quoted, as to the towns and cities of Galilee, we may suppose the number of its inhabitants to have reached fifteen or twenty thousand. We have, then, a mountain "city" of some importance and of considerable antiquity. We have the hill back of the town commanding that wonderful prospect. This hill must have had a name. We have the word נָצַר, *to behold, to see, to look*, and then *to watch, to guard*. In the latter sense (*watch* or *guard*), it is very often used in Hebrew (perhaps a dozen times). We have נֹצֵר, *one guarding;* and נֹצְרָה, *one guarding*, respectively masculine and feminine. נְצוּרָה, construct נְצוּרַת, *one guarded* (fem.). If Nazareth is from נְצוּרָה, it would signify the *watched or guarded one* (fem.), *i.e.*, the hill-top seen or beheld from afar. If from נֹצְרָה, we have the one *guarding* or *watching* (fem.), *i.e.*, the hill which overlooks a vast region,—in this case land and sea,—and thus guards it. Both these facts are true of the Nazareth-hill. The view of Hitzig, as given by Tobler,[3] making the name refer to some

[1] See Stanley, S. and P. 395, and note, about mountains in all countries being named from some peculiarity of themselves; also Keim, i. 320.

[2] Keim, i. 318.

[3] Nazareth, 35; Isa. xi. 1, is the only place where נֵצֶר is used with reference to Christ; compare Alford's Com. on Matt. ii. 23. Both the forms Nazara, and Nazareth appear in the oldest Greek MSS. See Delitzsch's "Jesus

helping goddess of the old Canaanitish times, we cannot adopt. The view above presented is one which seemed to us most plausible, and which we had written out and adopted before we had seen Keim's first volume. We are gratified to find that he connects the city with the hill as to the origin of its name; and he gives, in substance, the view we have adopted. We submit this as the most natural explanation of the origin of the word "Nazareth." It cannot be charged, as every one of the others can, with being "far-fetched." It relieves the name from any theological or prophetical character. If it was to have a theological or prophetical import, it was a great mistake, as we have said, to derive it from נָצַר, instead of from צֶמַח. נָצַר is used but once in any such connection; while צֶמַח is used many times.

Much is said about the "absolute seclusion" of Nazareth as the home of Christ. In regard to this point the following facts are important: 1. We have mentioned the probable size of the place. 2. The Nazareth-hill was seen and known throughout all that province, in Samaria also, and by the sailors on the Mediterranean Sea. 3. Its distance from other places—three short days' journey from Jerusalem; about six hours from Ptolemais, the port at which news and merchandise from Rome first reached Palestine (as regards the early receiving of news and merchandise from Rome, Galilee had advantage of Jerusalem and Judea); about five hours from the Sea of Galilee; two or three hours from Endor and Nain; two hours from Mount Tabor; about one hour and a half from Cana of Galilee; also one hour and a half from Sepphoris, which before Christ's time was the capital of Galilee, and even remaining so until Herod Antipas built Tiberias, in A.D. 28.[1]

und Hillel, xiv. note; Keim, i. 319, note. In some cases Tischendorf adopts "Nazara." See full notes and refs. on this subject in Tobler's "Nazareth," 34, 35. See Art. "Nazarene," Smith's Dict. Bib. iii. 2070, and authors there referred to. Keim, i. 319, 320, and note, gives a very full discussion of the subject; also, vol. ii. 421, 422; where is a multitude of refs. to the literature of the subject. Neubauer, 85, 190. See Fürst's Lexicon, under נָצַר; he does not allude to the question here discussed; yet one cannot read his article without being impressed that if the word *Nazareth* is to be derived from the Hebrew at all, it must come from this root, and have the signification which we have given and adopted.

[1] On these distances, see Smith's Dict. Bib. iii. 2072, col. 2. in Art. "Nazareth." Tobler, Nazareth, 1–3, and his very full refs. Date of building of Tiberias, see Lewin, p. 173, No. 1183.

4. Doubtless, roads led out from Nazareth in Christ's time in every direction, the same as to-day. "The main road for the land traffic between Egypt and the interior of Asia must have been the great highway leading past Gaza," through the mountains at Megiddo, and across the plain of Esdraelon, passing Nazareth near the foot of Tabor, and thence on to the northern Jordan and Damascus. If the caravan routes from Tyre and Sidon passed to the north of Nazareth, that from Ptolemais to Damascus would no doubt make Tiberias and Capernaum on its line, and hence would pass very near to Nazareth.[1] 5. In proximity to the capital of the province, Sepphoris,—which is in sight from the Nazareth-hill, and only one hour and a half to two hours distant,—and to other large cities, and its nearness to the great caravan routes of commerce, would bring it into constant intercourse with the centres of business and news (Ptolemais, Capernaum, Tiberias, Scythopolis, Sepphoris, and of course Damascus), and give it, in this respect, very important advantages, which they should consider well who insist upon the "great obscurity and isolation of the place"—a supposition wholly gratuitous, as is seen by the facts now presented.[2]

After what we have thus far learned of Galilee, it sounds strange enough to read, especially from an eminent author, that "Jesus grew up among a people seldom, or only contemptuously, named by the ancient classics, and subjected, at the time, to the yoke of a foreign oppressor; in a remote and conquered province of the Roman empire; in the darkest district of Palestine; in a country town of proverbial insignificance; in poverty and manual labour; in the obscurity of a carpenter's shop; far away from universities, academies, libraries, and literary or polished society," &c.[3] The whole paragraph gives an entirely wrong impression in regard to the city and province where Christ lived, and as to the circumstances of his early life. The *colouring* of this picture is false.

[1] On Roads, Ritter, iv. 370; Keim, i. 322; Ewald, Hist. Isr. iii. 261; Robinson, ii. 329; see full account in Arnaud, chap. xi. pp. 217–226, "Routes Anciennes et Modernes de la Palestine."

[2] Hausrath, i. 4. 9; Keim, i. 312, 322.

[3] Schaff, Person of Christ, 34. In regard to "manual labour," it should be remembered that in Christ's time it was a disgrace *not* to labour. The most eminent teachers engaged regularly in "manual labour." How far must Christ have gone to have found "universities, academies, and libraries"? Surely they did not exist in Jerusalem, if that is the point.

XIX. *Summary of Results: Galilee providentially fitted for the First Reception of Christ and His Gospel.*—After the careful review now closed, we feel justified in saying that Galilee at the time of Christ was one of the finest and most fertile portions of the earth. Stretching from the Mediterranean on the west to the Jordan and the sweet-watered Merom and Gennesareth on the east; abounding in springs, rivers, and lakes—among which its once hallowed sea was the gem and pride of the whole country, as it is for ever dear to Christian hearts; possessing a rare and delightful climate, and scenery of great variety and beauty; its surface never dull or monotonous, but infinitely varied by plains and valleys, gentle slopes and terraced hills, deep ravines and bold peaks, naturally fortified eminences and giant mountains; its soil naturally fertile, but forced by skilful husbandry to the highest state of productiveness, until this province was noted for the perfection and abundance of its fruits; Galilee thus possessed features of richness and beauty rarely if ever combined in so small a country in all the world besides. The surface of the country was covered with wealthy cities and flourishing towns, and crossed in many directions by her "way of the sea" and other great thoroughfares, which were thronged with the caravans of commerce. Its agriculture and fisheries, wine and oil trade, and other industries were in the most flourishing condition, being managed with energy and skill by a people who knew well how to use to advantage the resources of their highly favoured country.[1] Its synagogues and other public buildings were built often in splendid style and at great expense. Here money was abundant, and easily raised either for taxes, heavy tributes, military affairs, or for costly dwellings and palaces. Here all matters pertaining to the synagogal service and to the instruction of children were faithfully attended to, and here were found teachers, learned men, missionaries, poets, and patriots of the highest order.

In regard to the character of the Galileans, it is claimed that gold and dross were lying side by side.[2] But even those who discover in them a great deal of exterior roughness,[3] are compelled to admit that beneath this rough surface they possessed a fund of strength and talent which entitled them

[1] Graetz, iii. 394. [2] Keim, i. 316.
[3] Hausrath, i. 12; Graetz, iii. 395.

to the highest regard. But much of a positive character can be said in their praise. Their patriotism in national emergencies; their enthusiastic loyalty to their country's interests; their general adherence to the law of Moses in preference to tradition, which ruled and hampered the public mind in Jerusalem; their interest in the Temple and its solemn feasts; their deep-seated and inspiring hope, which looked with steadfast gaze towards the future—"waiting for the redemption of Israel,"—these things shew that the Jews of the north, at least equally with, and perhaps far beyond, those who dwelt beneath the very shadow of the Temple, maintained within themselves, in their integrity, some of the noblest traits of the Hebrew nation.[1] But farther, we find the Galileans to have been a moral, intelligent, industrious, and enterprising people, possessed of vigorous minds and healthy bodies—"healthy as their own climate and cheerful as their own sky,"[2]—a people familiar with their own law and history, and not wanting in the finest poetical spirit;[3] with the disposition and ability to appreciate in the main the teachings of Christ; a people among whom were found most devoted men, "Israelites indeed;" among whom, also, devotion to the national idea reached its highest development, till at last they rose, a solid wall of patriot hearts, to be crushed by the all-conquering power of Rome;[4] both country and people, one may say with truth, fitly chosen of God as the training-place of those men—Master and disciples—who were to move the world; the proper soil in which first to plant the seeds of that truth which was destined, ere long, to be spoken by eloquent lips in the pulpits of Cesarea, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome.

[1] The character of the people is seen in the very great honour paid by them to the memory of Elijah; see this eloquently set forth in Hausrath, i. 374.

[2] Keim, i. 312.

[3] Besides the poets mentioned, Mary, the mother of Christ, should be named as possessed of the rarest poetical gifts.

[4] Schneckenburger, p. 283, "Das Land fiel als Opfer der messianischen Idee, welche es gegenüber der Weltmacht Rom's realisiren wollte. Es war als ob die ganze Kraft des Judenthums an einen Ort zusammengedrängt worden wäre, um es mit einem Schlage zu vernichten."

## ART. II.—*Life and its Origin.*[1]

By Professor H. ALLEYNE NICHOLSON, of the University of Toronto.

*The Beginnings of Life.* By H. C. BASTIAN, M.D., F.R.S. London: Macmillan & Co.. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

IT may safely be said that there is no question at present agitated in the scientific world which has more interest for humanity at large than that of the Nature of Life, and the manner in which living beings originate. Upon the decision of this question, it may without exaggeration be said, depends to a large extent the future of the Christian religion. It touches upon beliefs which are at the very foundation of all religion; and now that inquiry has once commenced, all thoughtful men must wish that it should be carried out to the end, as quickly but as thoroughly, as the circumstances of the case admit of. From this point of view, if from no other, we can cordially thank Dr Bastian for his work on "The Beginnings of Life." He has, at least, done good service in assembling into a concrete and manageable form the doctrines of the school to which he belongs, and he further deserves our gratitude for the perfect candour with which his conclusions are always stated. These conclusions may be attacked from two sides, and from both, as it seems to us, with perfect fairness. In so far as his conclusions are purely scientific, they are open to scientific criticism, both as to the accuracy of the facts alleged to be observed, and also as to the justness of the deductions drawn therefrom. In so far, again, as his conclusions are at variance with primitive human beliefs as to the existence or immortality of the soul, or as to the existence of a Supreme Being, arguments derived from the domains of theology or moral philosophy may legitimately be employed to confute them.

Let us first briefly consider the general conclusions announced by Dr Bastian as the results of the investigations which he has carried out, evidently with much conscientious labour. Foremost amongst these conclusions must be placed the alleged establishment of the occurrence of "Spontaneous Generation"

[1] From the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* for October last.

(or, as the author prefers to call it, "Archebiosis") as an actual and common natural process. It is hardly necessary to remark that this doctrine implies the organisation and development of living beings from dead matter, independently of the influence of any pre-existing being. Thus, Dr Bastian thinks that he can prove that "synthetic processes occurring amongst the molecules of colloidal and allied substances" have the power to "engender or give origin to a kind of matter possessing that subtle combination of properties to which we are accustomed to apply the epithet 'living.'" He thinks he can shew that "both crystalline and living aggregates appear to be constantly separating *de novo* from different fluids, and both kinds of matter now seem to be naturally formable from their elements." He thinks that "a majority of scientific men, and a large section of the educated public" believe that spontaneous generation took place once, namely, when living beings first appeared upon the globe; and that if it occurred once, there is no reason why it should not have occurred again, and should not occur now. We should hardly have imagined that so prevalent an opinion existed as to the former occurrence of "Abiogenesis," but we are willing to take Dr Bastian's word for it. We may remark, however, that the *known* facts of geology afford no support to the view that the primitive population of the globe was introduced upon the scene in any such fashion. Omitting the *Eozoön* of the Laurentian Rocks—which many excellent observers do not regard as being the remains of an animal at all—the earliest known forms of life were such as could not by any possibility have been produced by any conceivable process of Archebiosis. The only living beings which could ever be imagined to arise *de novo*, are such as never could leave any record of their existence in the rocks; so that if "a majority of scientific men" hold that animals and plants were originally introduced upon the globe by spontaneous generation, they merely hold a view which, from the nature of the case, can never be supported by any tangible evidence.

Dr Bastian admits that it is "*invisible* colloidal particles" which "are supposed to combine and undergo re-arrangement in order to produce specks of new born living matter." He does not seem to see that this admission is absolutely and altogether fatal to his argument, that is, as against the alterna-

tive belief. If the supposed "colloidal particles" are *invisible*, how do we know that they are "colloidal," or how, indeed, can we know anything whatever as to their nature? Dr Bastian *chooses* to believe that the said particles are dead; *we* choose to believe that they are alive, and what is more, that they have proceeded from pre-existent living matter. By an appeal to what authority is it proposed to settle the question?

That such specks of living matter, after their production from the above-mentioned invisible particles, may actually be seen to develop into Fungus germs, Amoebæ, Monads, and Ciliated Infusorians, we can well believe; but we fail to see what possible bearing this can have on the question as to the occurrence of spontaneous generation. Seeing that the most experienced microscopist in the world would find it impossible to determine by his instrument whether a given ovum were that of a dog or a worm, we need not wonder that we cannot detect the differences which may exist in the immensely more minute "living specks" which constitute the youngest visible stages of Fungi, Monads, and the like. That these living specks are, upon this evidence, to be regarded as identical, and to have been formed *de novo* out of dead matter, is simply an assertion which cannot be proved and has not even probability in its favour.

When, again, we are told that "living units of an *Algoid* nature can actually be *seen* to be "converted into the embryos of large and complex Rotifers," we find it necessary to ask a question of a kind of which every careful reader of this work would feel inclined to ask many. We are expected to believe, in effect, that some of the lowest *plants* can be seen to develop bodily into *animals*, and, indeed, into animals of a comparatively high grade of organization. Now, seeing that these "units of an Algoid nature" are microscopic, it is only fair that Dr Bastian should tell us *how he knows that they were Algoid, or that they belonged to the vegetable kingdom at all.* Of course, if he has any evidence *in petto*, by which he can prove this point, we will succumb—when it is produced. In the meanwhile, no evidence of the kind is brought forward, and we prefer to believe what most naturalists would believe, that any such dogmatic reference of a microscopic cell to the animal or vegetable kingdom, is simply preposterous. Suppose we elect to believe—as we do—that the young forms of certain

of the Rotifers are very like Algæ in appearance, and that *this* is the explanation of the facts observed by Dr Bastian, how does he propose to alter our unfortunate prejudices? The only possible proof as to the animal or vegetable character of these microscopic organisms, is an appeal to their life history, which, in this particular case, clearly proves them to be animals. Assertions of this nature are merely a melancholy proof of the effect of pre-conceived opinions upon the mind.

Finally, we are asked to believe not only that living matter proceeds naturally from non-living matter (Archebiosis), but that living beings of one quite distinct kind can readily be transformed into living beings of quite another kind—just as yellow phosphorus when heated to a certain point becomes red phosphorus, and when heated still further passes back again into yellow phosphorus. This is what our author has termed *Heterogenesis.*

Without entering into this matter at length, we will merely remark that the facts recounted by Dr Bastian appear to come under three heads. Some of them appear to be referable to defects of observation, and are too incredible to be accepted except after repeated investigation by thoroughly competent workers with the microscope. Others are doubtless correct but will bear a totally different interpretation to that put upon them by Dr Bastian. Others, lastly, cannot be regarded as being more than peculiar modes of development, not more remarkable than the well-known developmental history of the Hydroid Zoophytes, and probably of very much the same essential nature.

The above being the general results arrived at, we shall now proceed to criticise briefly a few of the more salient points treated of in these remarkable volumes, anything like a detailed survey of the mass of material here accumulated being altogether out of the question. In the first place, we have to consider the doctrines as to the nature of life and its connection with the physical forces, held by Dr Bastian and the scientific school to which he belongs. These doctrines are now tolerably familiar to the reading public, and if they do not improve upon acquaintance, it is certainly not from any lack of energy on the part of those who advocate them. Stated shortly, these doctrines may be said to comprise three principal propositions.

Firstly, it is believed that force and matter are absolutely inseparable, that "one cannot exist without the other," and that they are merely "two aspects of something one and indivisible." Secondly, it is believed that there is no such thing as "vital force," and that what we call "life" is merely a form of one of the physical forces, namely, a mode of motion. Thirdly, it is held that the spiritual life of man is the same in kind as his physical life, and this also is nothing more than a modification of some physical force, that "sensation and thought are the products of molecular changes taking place in nerve-organs," and that the spiritual phenomena of man are inseparable from the matter by which they are manifested. In fact, since matter and force are "absolutely inseparable," we are to believe that what we have been accustomed to regard as our "soul," is merely some subtile form of ordinary matter. Dr Bastian does not, perhaps, put it quite so plainly as this; but this is exactly what it amounts to when stripped of verbiage.

How any one who is not pledged beforehand to certain doctrines, can promulgate theories of this nature as if they were established and universally accepted beliefs, about which there could be no difference of opinion, passes our comprehension. Every one, we presume, will admit that as we live in a material world and inhabit a material body, we cannot become *cognizant* of any physical force except through the medium of matter; or, in other words, such force can only manifest itself by means of matter. Nothing, however, would be a more unwarrantable deduction from this admission than the conclusion that force has no existence except as a form of matter. It *may* be so, but no possible proof can be brought forward that it is so. So far, at any rate, as our spiritual essence is concerned, we should imagine that most men have a pretty strong conviction, derived from inherent feelings and based upon primeval instincts, that it is *not* so. Most men, we should imagine, are conscious of having within them a *power* which is independent of and can *control* the forces of the outer world, which will not cease to exist when separated from the body, and which cannot be regarded as a mere "aspect" of matter. In short, we cannot regard this theory in any other light than as a complete abandonment of the belief in the immortality of the soul as a distinct entity.

To say, as Professor Frankland has said, than "an animal, however high its organization, can no more generate (that is, actually create) an amount of force capable of moving a grain of sand, than a stone can fall upwards, or a locomotive drive a train without fuel," is true enough; but, after all, what does it amount to when fairly examined? No one says, or supposes, that man, or any other animal, can *create* physical force. What it is necessary to assert is simply that man is the seat of something in virtue of which he can subdue, regulate, and combine the physical forces of the universe to his own ends. Man cannot create the force necessary to drive a locomotive or even to move a grain of sand, but he can *make* the locomotive, and when made he can compel certain of the physical forces to drive it. What modification of physical force can do the like? When will sun-force make an Atlantic cable for us, not to speak of making a man for us, as we are virtually asked to believe? In the words of Dr Lionel Beale, we must consider the vast difference which there is between power, force, and property:

"*Power* is capable of activity; it may design, arrange, form, construct, build. *Property* is passive and belongs to the material particles, and is no more capable of destruction than the particles themselves. *Force* differs from property, in that its form or mode may be changed or conditioned and assume other forms, and be afterwards restored to the original one. Power may cease and vanish, but property is retained, and force, in one form or other, is persistent. Neither matter, nor force, nor property, can wholly disappear; but all order, design, arrangement, guidance, form, structure, construction, may vanish. *Power* alone imposes upon the material the wonderful order which everywhere manifests itself in nature. The property of the material renders such imposition possible, but does not effect it."

It is all very well to say that we may "reduce the visible phenomena of life to mechanical attractions and repulsions" (Tyndall); but we have to ask ourselves if the most essential phenomena of life *are* "visible"? And, in any case, supposing that every phenomenon of life were accompanied by molecular movement, is the *accompaniment* to be regarded as identical with the thing which it constantly accompanies? Is it philosophical to consider the essential *condition* of a phenomenon as being the phenomenon itself? It has been alleged that all forms of mental activity are associated with molecular movement of part of the brain, though excellent

physiologists can be found to disse
assertion. Admitting, however, for th
such molecular movement is an essent
in this our present state of being, are
ing therefrom, that thought *is* nothing
particles? Upon similar reasoning,
never exhibits himself to his fellow-
with his dog, we may be justified in
is the dog.

To assert, again, as the above-quot
asserts, that "at the present moment
science, all our art—Plato, Shakespea
—are *potential in the fires of the sun*,
but it is in a sense which renders
platitude, instead of the brilliant an
which it might on cursory inspection
in the sense merely that our material
by the sun. It is quite certain that if
Shakespeare, Plato, and Newton woul
*upon our globe.* Nor, if the sun s
light and heat, will there be any f
Platos; but then there will be no me
it does not appear to us to matter muc
looked into, it appears that Dr Tynd
is really doing no more than impar
information that we cannot live with
bably he himself would interpret h
positive and radical sense, but it woul
he could not bring forward the smalle

As a corollary of the physical th
necessary to the theory, Dr Bastian s
"organisation" is the cause of life, i
that a living being possesses organis
He also devotes a considerable por
endeavour to shew the correctness
force" is a correlate of the ordinary
vital phenomena are merely the r
modified, transformed, or conditioned
"passage through the organism."

The view that vital force is indepe
series, and is a peculiar power residen

which "conditions or transforms the physical forces, in order that they give rise to the most varied vital phenomena," he entirely discredits, though much of the reasoning is of the lowest description, consisting either of baseless assertions, or of misconceptions of the views of his opponents. The chief argument, perhaps, that Dr Bastian brings forward in support of his views is, that "if the vital or directive power, resident in each particle of a living being, be other than a transformed physical force, it must be one which—in spite of the well-known formula '*ex nihilo nihil fit*'—is capable of indefinite self-multiplication. Either such force must be continually springing into being *without a cause*—originating itself, or growing out of nothing—which is an absurdity; or else within the human ovum, or that of any other animal, there must be *locked up in this one tiny microscopic cell, the whole of the peculiar vital power* which is afterwards to diffuse itself throughout the body." The idea of vital force, or any other force, springing continually into being *without a cause*, is, of course, "an absurdity;" but then we are not aware that any one of the modern vitalists ever entertained such an idea. Dr Bastian does not seem to be aware, however, that there are foolish people who still believe in a *First Cause*, and who still cling fondly to the idea that—

> "All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
> Whose body nature is, and God the soul."

How does Dr Bastian's reasoning touch the old and venerable belief that the constant origination of vital force proceeds from a Supreme Being, in whom we "live, move, and have our being"? Is such a notion too unphilosophical to be even seriously discussed? What if we assert that whilst mind may exist without matter, matter cannot exist without mind, and that living beings are vivified by influx from the universal Mind, in whom alone are the springs of existence, and with whom is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning"? We may, to say the least of it, safely declare that Dr Bastian, in the present state of his knowledge, will find it impossible to disprove the above view, by any process of reasoning, or by any facts at his command. In the words of Dr Hutchison Stirling:

"This universe is not an accidental cavity, in which an accidental dust has been accidentally swept into heaps for the accidental evolution of

the majestic spectacle of organic and inorganic life. That majestic spectacle is a spectacle as plainly for the eye of reason as any diagram of mathematics. That majestic spectacle could have been constructed, *was* constructed, only in reason, for reason, and by reason. From beyond Orion and Pleiades, across the green hem of earth, up to the imperial personality of man, all, the furthest, the deadest, the dustest, is for fusion in the invisible point of the single Ego—*which alone glorifies it. For* the subject, and on the model of the subject, all is made."

We have no wish to import the *odium theologicum* into this discussion; still less do we wish to say anything which Dr Bastian could regard as personal, the more especially as it is not always safe to deduce a writer's religious beliefs from his scientific opinions. We cannot avoid saying, however, that we have read with pain the following passage in his pages:

"A force independent of the correlated series of physical forces, and yet capable of perpetual existence, with apparently undiminished powers in spite of an almost infinite number of divisions and sub-divisions, surely there are few who will believe that such a force can exist. The doctrine is absolutely inconceivable, it cannot be realised in thought."

We should hope that there are very many who can and will believe in just such a force, for we do not see otherwise how it is possible to retain the conception of a Supreme Being. Nay, more, instead of seeing anything "absolutely inconceivable" in this belief, we look upon it as distinctly natural to the human mind, as according thoroughly with men's mental constitution, we had almost said as an "instinctive" conception. It is true that such a conception is beyond our comprehension, but space and time are conceptions equally beyond our comprehension, and yet we do not think of doubting their existence, at any rate, as necessary forms of thought. In fact, if we are only to believe what we can *comprehend*, we must believe nothing, for the comprehension of one finite thing would imply a knowledge of the Infinite. As the poet says of the weed:

"—If I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."

Why, asks Dr Bastian again, should a "special force" be needed "to effect the transformation of physical forces into those modes of energy which are active in the manifestations of living beings, whilst no peculiar force is deemed necessary

to effect the transformation of one mode of physical force into any other mode of physical force?" Truly it is marvellous that any one should miss the answer to such a question. Why, we may in turn ask, when we see a locomotive, do we imagine that we see the work of a special force? We do so, because we know that all the physical forces of the universe, modified, combined, or "transformed" in any way we please, would never "transform" themselves into a locomotive. We know that in the shaping of the locomotive was concerned some *power*, with the capacity of subduing and commanding the physical forces. Similarly, when we see a man, "a white European man, standing on his two legs, with his two five-fingered hands at his shacklebones, and miraculous head on his shoulders," we rightly conclude that, being at least as wonderful and complicated as a locomotive, some "special force" must have been at work in his production. At any rate, it remains for the advocates of the New Decalogue to show us not only *how* a man may be produced by the "transformation" of some force, but that he actually *is* so produced. When they can demonstrate this, we will believe it, but in the meanwhile we confess we "are for the angels." We most heartily endorse the views put forward on this subject by Dr Beale, as to the total impotence of the physical forces so far as *construction* is concerned:

"Force is actually opposed to construction, and before anything can be built up, the tendencies of force must be overcome by *formative agency* or power. Unless force is first conquered, and then regulated and directed, structure will not be evolved. Force may destroy and dissipate, but it cannot build; it may disintegrate, but it cannot fashion; it may crush, but it is powerless to create. It is doubtful if it would be possible to adduce a dogma more unfounded than the dogma that the sun forms or builds, constructs or resolves itself into anything that possesses structure, and is capable of performing definite work of any kind for any purpose."

To sum up Dr Bastian's views, he believes that the properties of living beings "are as much dependent upon the mere qualities and nature of the material aggregate which displays them as the properties of a metal or the properties of a crystal are the results of the nature and mode of collocation of the atoms of which these bodies are composed." He believes that, "philosophically speaking, there can be no abrupt line of demarcation between the living and not living." He

believes that "living things are peculiar aggregates of ordinary matter and ordinary force, which, in their separate states, do not possess the aggregate of qualities known as 'Life.'" Finally, he believes that "the transition must be most gradual" between the ordinary states of dead matter and living beings. We cannot stop further to examine these assertions. We must content ourselves with simply denying that, confidently as they are put forward, they have been in any way proved by Dr Bastian.

We pass on now briefly to consider what proofs are brought forward by Dr Bastian as to the occurrence of "Archebiosis," the "Spontaneous Generation" of older writers, the "Abiogenesis" of Huxley—namely, the occurrence of the formation of living beings *de novo* out of dead matter, without the agency of a pre-existing living being. Confessedly—even by Dr Bastian—we cannot form living beings directly out of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and the other primary constituents of the "matter of life." Confessedly, also, the actual passage of dead molecules into living matter has never been seen, and cannot be demonstrated. Upon what, then, does Dr Bastian rely in his argument for the daily occurrence of Abiogenesis? In his preface, he states that the question turns almost wholly upon the *de novo* origin of Bacteria, and we are very willing that the question should be narrowed to this point. In the first place, then, What are Bacteria, and what are the phenomena of their origin? If we take any fluid containing an organic substance in solution, and allow it to be exposed to air in a moderately-warm place, we should find that, in a time varying from a few hours to a few days, a whitish scum or pellicle would form upon its surface. If the fluid be now examined with the microscope, it is found to swarm with exceedingly-minute moving particles or molecules, along with short, staff-shaped or rod-like bodies, which also move about more or less actively, and which constitute what are known as *Bacteria*. The scum is likewise found to be composed of "a dense superficial aggregation" of these same molecules and Bacteria. What the Bacteria actually are nobody knows; but it is most probable that they are referable to the lowest forms of plants. By Dr Bastian—but upon no ascertainable evidence—they are regarded as being neither animals nor

vegetables, but as being organism of an intermediate grade. The *visible* phenomena of the *origin* of Bacteria are thus described by Dr Bastian. Examining a drop of the fluid, immediately after its preparation, with the higher powers of the microscope, a portion is selected in which no visible solid particles can be detected. Watching this carefully,

"in the course of three or four hours, faint and ill-defined whitish specks, less than 1–50,000 of an inch in diameter, make their appearance pretty evenly disposed throughout the field of view. These are at first almost motionless—exhibiting only the merest vibrations, but no progressive movements. They gradually become more distinct, assume a sharper outline, and after a variable time some of them develop into distinct *Bacteria*. At first they exhibit gentle oscillations and tremblings only, though gradually they display the more characteristic darting movements."

The above being the essential phenomena which characterise the formation of Bacteria, let us now see what explanation can be given of the facts—facts which every one allows, and which indeed every one can readily verify for himself. So far as *direct observation* is concerned, Dr Bastian admits that nothing can be positively proved, and that we are left with only two possible alternatives. Either the Bacteria "have been developed from a multitude of pretty evenly-disseminated *invisible* germs, or they have been produced *de novo* in the fluid by a process of Archebiosis." Thus, as Dr Bastian further admits, the question passes beyond the reach of actual demonstration. He can never convince us that there were no invisible germs in the fluid to begin with, and we can never convince him that such germs were present. Each of us, therefore, is entitled to retain his own opinion upon this portion of the subject.

Failing direct observation, we still have the test of vital resistance to heat, which has usually been regarded as a very safe and reliable one. If, namely, the fluid experimented upon be first exposed to a sufficient temperature, and be then hermetically sealed up, it is alleged that all living beings existing beforehand in the fluid must necessarily be destroyed; so that if any living organisms are found in the fluid at the end of the experiment, they must necessarily have been produced *de novo*, by a process of Abiogenesis. There are, however, three things to observe here. In the first place, all experiments undertaken with a view of proving the vital

resistance to heat, can only be undertaken with adult organisms, or, at any rate, with organisms so far advanced in growth as to be *visible* under the higher powers of the microscope. It is open to any one to maintain that the facts ascertained as to the heat which can be endured by visible organisms have no bearing on the question as to the vital resistance to heat possessed by the unknown or invisible *germs* of these organisms. Adult Bacteria may very possibly be uniformly destroyed by a given temperature (from 127° to 140°), but this proves nothing as to the possible temperature that the invisible *germs* of Bacteria may be able to withstand. It is *not*, therefore, sufficient, as alleged by Dr Bastian, "to know what are the limits of vital resistance to high temperatures possessed by spores of Fungi on the one hand, and Bacteria and Vibriones on the other." We can, of course, prove nothing as to the qualities of invisible germs, so that Dr Bastian's argument involves a serious fallacy. Here, as in the case of direct observation, the question passes beyond the reach of actual demonstration. We are quite at liberty, if we choose, to believe that the unknown and invisible germs of Bacteria are capable of surviving, uninjured, exposure to temperatures which are unconditionally fatal to the adult.

In the second place, opinions are by no means at one as to the exact temperature which *is* fatal to some of these low organisms, even the visible ones. Thus, Dr Bastian seems to think that 212° is unconditionally fatal; but Dr Crace-Calvert's experiments would seem to shew that Vibriones can survive a temperature of 300°. There is, further, no absolute proof that these inconceivably minute particles are actually raised in all cases, at any rate, to the temperature of the fluid in which they are immersed.

In the third place, there is still no unanimity as to the actual results obtained in this way by experiments on organic fluids which have been exposed to high temperatures and then hermetically sealed against the entrance of air. Dr Bastian alleges that he has almost uniformly obtained positive results from these experiments, and we select one out of many, as an example:

A strong infusion of turnip, rendered alkaline by the addition of a little liquor potassæ, and having a few muscular fibres of a cod-fish added to it, was submitted for twenty minutes to a

temperature of from 270° to 275° Fahr., and subsequently, while still at this heat, hermetically sealed against the entrance of air. It was then maintained at a temperature of from 70° to 80° Fahr., and was also exposed to the action of direct sunlight.

"The vacuum having been ascertained to be partially preserved, the neck of the flask was broken two months after the date of its preparation. . . . . The fluid was very slightly turbid, and there was a well-marked sediment, consisting of reddish-brown fragments, and a light, flocculent deposit. On microscopical examination, the fragments were found to be portions of altered muscular fibre, whilst the flocculent deposit was composed, for the most part, of granular aggregations and *Bacteria*. In the portions of fluid and deposit which were examined, there were thousands of *Bacteria* of most diverse shapes and sizes, either separate or aggregated into flakes. There were also a large number of monilated chains of various lengths, though mostly short; a large number of small spherical *Torula* cells, with mere granular contents, and a smaller number of ovoid, vacuolated cells. There were, in addition, a considerable number of brownish, nucleated spores, gradually increasing in size from mere specks, about 1–30,000 of an inch in diameter, up to bodies 1–2,500 of an inch in diameter; and also a small quantity of a mycelial filament, having solid protoplasmic contents, broken at intervals and bearing bud-like projections, each of which was capped with a single spore."

In other experiments substantially the same results were obtained, even when solutions of certain salts were substituted for organic fluids.

Even admitting, as we cannot do, that all sources of fallacy had been avoided in these extremely delicate and difficult pieces of manipulation, in which the largest objects we have to deal with are about 1–3000 of an inch in diameter, whilst the smallest are certainly invisible to the highest powers of the microscope known to us,—even admitting this for a moment, it is to be remembered that other admirable and thoroughly reliable observers have not succeeded in obtaining the same results as Dr Bastian in similar experiments. Thus, both Professor Frankland and Dr Burdon Sanderson failed to obtain any evidence of life in solutions which had been previously highly heated, and subsequently hermetically sealed against the air. One positive result, if absolutely certain and free from any conceivable fallacy, would of course outweigh any number of negative results; but we do not think that the

above can be predicated of the results obtained by Dr Bastian. We think, on the contrary, that there was plenty of room for fallacy, and even if the results of the experiments are to be accepted, we still think that they may be explained without having recourse to the doctrine of Abiogenesis. We think this might be safely asserted, if only upon the ground that Dr Bastian alleges himself to have obtained living beings in flasks super-heated beyond the boiling point of water, in a nearly complete vacuum, *almost or quite as abundantly as they would have occurred in an unboiled organic infusion, simply exposed to the atmosphere.* Considerable stress also may safely be laid upon the results obtained by Dr Burdon Sanderson, who has justly acquired the highest reputation as an original investigator in this field of research. This distinguished observer has arrived at the following conclusions as to the origin of Bacteria in organic solutions:

1. That Bacteria and Fungi are *never* developed in solutions which have been raised to the boiling point and subsequently sealed against the air, provided the vessel containing the solution has been previously carefully cleaned and boiled.

2. That if such solutions are exposed to the air, yeast plants and moulds are developed in them, but *no* Bacteria; shewing that the germs of the *latter* are not naturally present in the atmosphere.

3. That if such solutions are brought into contact with uncleaned glass surfaces, or if they are made with unboiled water, numerous Bacteria are always developed in them; shewing that the germs of Bacteria are disseminated by means of water and damp surfaces.

We shall not pursue this subject further; but we may repeat our conviction that Dr Bastian is, to say the least of it, premature in his assertion, that the results of his experiments or organic solutions "cannot be reasonably explained, except on the supposition that the living things obtained from the closed flasks had been developed from newly evolved living matter." The opponents of spontaneous generation have, at any rate, always the option of taking refuge in the unassailable, if unprovable, position that the *germs* of Bacteria, of which we know nothing, are *not* killed by exposure to temperatures of 300° and upwards.

# AMERICAN QUARTERLIES.

1. *The New Englander.* July 1874. New Haven.
2. *The Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Eclectic.* July 1874. Andover.
3. *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review.* July 1874. New York.

1. *The New Englander* contains an account of "The Negotiations on the Swedish Invasion of Germany," which opens up a view of the political complications in which these two countries were involved at the period of the Reformation and the Thirty Years' War (1517–1648). The conduct of Gustavus Adolphus in connection with this invasion occupies, as might be expected, a prominent place. The "Compendium der Logik," by Dr H. Ulrici, of Halle, is reviewed in a lengthened and able paper. The author of this article is quite at home in tracing, by a few rapid sketches, the course of German philosophy from the days of Kant. He describes Ulrici's Logic as an attempt to recall philosophy to criticism, to rescue it from the dreadful treadmill-round of a one-sided idealism. Since Kant's time German philosophy has had little in common with logic, and less with the facts of consciousness. Ulrici opens the way to a return to the critical stand-point. Another paper of much interect is "The Protestantism of Medieval German Art." The author shews that a robust individuality creates a *protest*-ant, and that Protestantism strengthens the inherent force of the individual. He rests his discussion on the historical position, that in Germany chivalry, the offspring of northern nations, was the forerunner and inspiration of Protestantism; and that after the decline of chivalry, the culture of individual force, which was all-potent in chivalry, perpetuated itself in Germany under fresh forms of art. Verse, architecture, painting, sculpture, religion, and music—all shewed the spirit of Protestantism; and even now the German mind is in an attitude of unrest, of investigation, for or against established things. This is altogether an interesting historical monograph. The remaining papers are reminiscences of the great Hebraist Dr Isaac Nordheimer, whose Hebrew Grammar threw new light on the power of the verb. His researches formed a fresh point of departure for Hebrew students—the labours of the American Home Missionary, Salmon Giddings, a singularly devoted and successful labourer in the Lord's cause; the "Sect System;" a review of Robert Browning's poem, entitled "Prince Hohenstiel-Schwangau, Saviour of Society," a poem written with a political purpose of no great significance; "A new theory of Minority Representation," these are the other papers.

2. *The Bibliotheca Sacra* has a series of papers, all of which may be regarded as of the first order of merit, from the pens of writers entitled to be heard on their respective subjects. The writer of the "Exegesis of

Acts xxvi. 28, 29," argues in favour of the opinion (held also by Meyer, De Wette, Neander, Lechler, and Alford) that the words of Agrippa are a scornful outburst. The writer arrives at the result that ἐν ὀλίγῳ never means *almost*, that it means in a short time, or in a brief address, *i. e.*, with little effort, pains ; that the latter interpretation is here required if we adopt in verse 29 the reading ἐν μεγάλῳ, which now seems to have the weight of MS. authority. Agrippa in effect says, as Dr Vaughan has paraphrased the words, "What, in so short a space and on so slight a summons to become a Christian ; to forfeit perhaps fortune and rank, and to become the brother and the fellow of an outcast like thee ; to part with all as the result of listening in a casual visit to a poor prisoner's self-defence ; such changes are not for me !" Paul's answer is in harmony with his well-known character, firm, discreet, and courteous. It is in effect : "Well, be it sooner or later ; be it on the sudden, or on long reflection ; be it by my brief words, or by any other process which God may see fit in His wisdom and in His mercy to employ ; my heart's desire and prayer is that thou, with all that hear me, mightest become such as I am, except these bonds." Dr Hill discusses "The natural foundation of Theology," and shews the validity of the teleological argument from the adaptation of means to ends, and the morphological from the conformity of parts to a general plan. Dr Osgood, of New York, gives an account of "Richard Rothe's ministry in Rome" (1824–28), under the auspices of Bunsen and the German Court. The article is in effect a very clear and instructive history of the relation of Germany to Rome, and of the personal preparation which Rothe underwent while in Rome for the prominent position he afterwards filled as professor in the Seminary at Wittenberg. What he saw and learned in Rome made him more and more a Protestant. "The use of לֹא with negative Particles," is a very elaborate and exhaustive exhibition of the Hebrew *usus loquendi* in the matter of universal and partial negation, by Professor Mead, of Andover. The author arrives at very important conclusions of great value to the Old Testament exegete. The investigation was undertaken by the writer in connection with the revision of the authorised version of the Bible. An appreciative historical paper on "Edmund Burke," by Professor Shepard, follows. The writer duly, and with much discrimination, estimates the character and influence of Burke as an orator and a writer. The remaining articles are—"A June Day in Jerusalem," being a translation of one of the chapters of Delitzsch's "Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu." With great vividness the writer reproduces what he conceives would be the actual scene in Jerusalem shortly before the advent of our Lord. "The Unity of our Lord's Discourses," by Dr Gardner, well-known for his labours in connection with the Harmony of the Gospels ; the "Baptism of Infants and their Church-Membership," a *resumé* of the opinions of modern writers on that subject.

3. The *Princeton* has a paper by Dr Green, of Princeton, on "Assyrian Monuments and the Bible," which has rightly assigned to it the place of pre-eminence. This paper is based on Rawlinson's "Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia," and has as its object to shew how the history and

chronology of the Bible have been illustrated and confirmed by these monuments, and chiefly by their inscriptions. "The Abduction of Avedick" is a paper from the French of Marius Topin. Avedick was Grand Patriarch of the Armenians at Constantinople in the time of the Marquis de Ferriol, who was ambassador of Louis XIV. (1699) at the Turkish Court. The narrative shews the persistent hatred the Marquis cherished toward Avedick, and the efforts he made to ruin him, and finally his abduction to the Abbey of Mount St Michael, a rocky islet on the sea-coast of Normandy. Thence he was removed to the Bastile, from which he was released after having been induced to profess the Catholic faith. The old man, who had passed through so strange a history, died some ten months after his release (1711). The history is singular as shewing the political and Popish complications of the time. "The Approaches to the English Language," is practically a plea for the establishment of Chairs at the Universities for the study of philology, and especially English philology. The writer argues that there is but one way of learning English philology well, and that way is through Gothic. The study of English, he holds, does not begin with Aelfric or Cynevulf, or even Beovulf, but with Ulfilas.

---

## GERMAN AND DUTCH PERIODICALS.

*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1874. II.

A contribution to "Pauline Eschatology," by Professor R. Stähelin of Basel, deals with the passage 1 Thess. iv. 13–17, and derives its main interest from a careful comparison of the views of Paul with the eschatology of the Jewish apocalyptic about the same period. It is frequently supposed that before the time of Christ all the spiritual hopes of the Jews were gathered up in the Messianic idea. From this view the essayist entirely dissents, and concludes that, while the national and theocratic hopes of Judaism centred in the Messiah, the longings of the higher spiritual life, especially of the individual religious life, pointed to an αἰὼν μέλλων subsequent to and not identical with the Messianic kingdom. It is to be observed that, in developing this view, Stähelin takes chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi. of the Book of Enoch to be post-Christian additions, and is also inclined to regard Apoc. Baruch xxx. 1, 2 as an interpolation. We cannot here rehearse his account of the doctrine of the various apocalyptic books; but we may mention, as a single example, that it is proved from the *Assumptio Mosis* that it was by no means an understood thing in the time of Christ that the prophecies of Daniel refer to the Messiah. Combining these results with the passage of 1 Thessalonians, Stähelin urges that the Thessalonians cannot have been doubtful as to the doctrine of the resurrection, but only as to the connection of the resurrection with

the Parousia, and therefore of the share of deceased believers in this specific hope of Christians. To this doubt Paul replies, ver. 14, that the death and resurrection of Jesus is a proof that believers will be raised through Him and brought with Him (join διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ with ἄξει). And this doctrine rests on a word of the Lord (ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, ver. 15), which word must be sought wholly in ver. 16, from the use of the first person in vers. 15, 17. The reference in ver. 16 is to the utterance of our Lord preserved in Matt. xxiv. 29–31; and Paul's argument is, that the Lord Himself—the exalted Messiah, and none other—is to come with the κέλευσμα, or divine word of power summoning the dead, the voice of the archangel, and the last trumpet, *i.e.* with the three signs of the great day of the Lord, and the in-bringing of the αἰὼν μέλλων. That is, the Parousia and the Resurrection are one and the same event, so that living Christians have no advantage over those who have died. Some concluding remarks on the meaning of ver. 17, and on the relation of this passage to the eschatological views expressed by Paul in other passages, are rather vague and obscure. They deal with Pauline Chiliasm and Universalism, and with the significance of the meeting in the air, which the essayist seems to regard as in some sense the seat of the Chiliastic kingdom.

An able paper on Tolerance, by Professor Krauss, who has now removed from Marburg to Strassburg, is cast in semi-popular form, but contains much common sense on a subject less understood in Germany than in this country, though what is said on the burial question is not altogether unnecessary even in England. We quote a single passage on the question of Church and State, which puts forth a view not now very popular in the German empire:—"The demand not for mere toleration, but for the concession of equal rights to all parties consistent with the existence of the State, and hence the separation of the affairs of Church and State, which need not prevent the State from having fixed ordinances on all questions of justice and watching all parties, is really in the interests, not only of the State, but of all parties which have faith in themselves, and are assured of the strength of their principles. . . . Exceptional privileges are sought by those who think themselves lost if they have not special protection."

Dr Bartels continues his discussion of the Baptist question, maintaining the right of infant baptism, but rejecting the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; and Dr Hamberger makes an "Endeavour to come to an understanding with the reviewers" of his *Physica Sacra*.

### *Theologische Studien und Kritiken.* 1874. IV.

More than half this number is occupied by a first article on the Johannine Question, from the pen of Dr Beyschlag. In this paper the essayist endeavours to shew that the theory which makes the fourth gospel a "Logos-romance," is wholly untenable For (1) the author is himself a man who stands on historical faith, and cannot therefore have constructed a fictitious basis for his own belief; (2) the theory that the book reconstructs the gospel history on certain ideal principles is in its application throughout violent and unnatural; (3) the gospel of John shews

in a number of points a knowledge of facts at first hand, superior to that of the synoptical gospels. A second article is to discuss the peculiarities and difficulties of the gospel, the side of the question on which the negative side is strong, however weak in its romance theory. It will be well to reserve details as to this important essay till Professor Beyschlag has completed his undertaking.

An article by Pfarrer Kaverau on Luther and the Marriage Question is called forth by the recent German law of civil marriage, and is specially directed against an extraordinary attempt in a Prussian church magazine to prove that the principle *mutuus consensus facit matrimonium* is Semi-pelagian, and one of the Romish errors overcome by Luther. This is easily refuted ; and it is shewn that Luther and the orthodox Lutherans clearly distinguish between espousal proper, which is constituted by mutual consent, and the blessing of the Church, which is not necessary to true marriage. Even the formula of *copula sacerdotalis* was retained by Luther simply in the sense of a *declaratory* act. The conclusion is that recent legislation does not touch the province of the Church, which can still exercise its function of invoking a blessing on the civil marriage.

An essay by Lic. C. Budde, on supposed metrical forms in Hebrew poetry, leads only to the already well-established result that no such forms have been, or are likely to be, found.

*Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie.* 1874. III.

The number opens with a long paper by Hilgenfeld on Polycarp of Smyrna. The author puts together in his usual manner all that is known of Polycarp, noticing recent points of dispute, and refreshing the memory of his readers upon his own earlier contributions to the subject. The paper strongly defends against Keim and Scholten the accuracy of the tradition that makes Polycarp a disciple of John, and in this connection again goes over good part of the recent controversy on John in Asia Minor. The year of Polycarp's death is fixed in accordance with Waddington's investigations as 155, or rather by a correction of Lipsius as 156, and it is argued that the 26th of March, not the 23d of February, was the day of his martyrdom. The genuineness of the epistle from Smyrna relating his death is maintained, and though the Epistle to the Philippians is rejected, Hilgenfeld would ascribe to Polycarp several citations which Irenæus makes from "ὁ κρείσσων ἡμῶν," "ὁ θεῖος περιβόητος," and the like. There is real importance in the new date for Polycarp's death (already discussed in Nos. I. and II. of the present year of this journal), which brings him ten years nearer the apostolic age. Harmsen examines the usage of εἰς τό with an infinitive in the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. Meyer holds that this construction is always telic, and with this view Harmsen agrees when the infinitive is Aorist, as in Rom. i. 11, iv. 18, &c. ; but when the infinitive is present, would translate differently. Thus in Rom. iv. 11, he renders "so that he is father," in Rom i. 30, "so that they are without excuse," and so on. The new rule does not seem quite precise, for the essayist gives the infinitive a somewhat different modality in passages like 1 Cor. x. 6, where the rendering given is not "so that you are not," but "so that you be not."

Seufert collects parallels between Romans
prove that the latter epistle is altogether
Professor Holsten in a lengthy paper propose
with the first half of xii. 1 as an interpolatio
"weakness" in xi. 30 of a bodily weakness
his enjoyment of visions. The interpolation
failed to see this, and thought it necessary to
from the Apostle's history. In carrying out
mix up the reason which Paul gives for his
modern psycho-pathological arguments about
states with ill health. Finally, Schweizer
mann's *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, and Lau
of the two supposed unknown writings of
number of the journal is not an *ineditum*.

*Theologisch Tijdschrift.* 1874.

In the fourth number Dr A. D. Loman
torian fragment, mainly in criticism of the re
(*Das Muratorische Fragment neu untersucht u*
Straatman proposes to amend the text of
ὑπίγγυος (under pledge to his daughter's lover
of ὑπέρχομαι, and στίλεσθαι instead of γίνεσθαι.
the nature and good right of religion, while
September number with an essay on a cognat
Metaphysic. Both papers are suggested by
at a meeting of "modern" theologians at
ran as follows: What is the value of recent
from all metaphysic, to regard it as a view o
universe, and to describe Christianity as
Hugenholtz, is a question as to the justice o
religion. And he argues that even the posit
not based on and verified by observation,
external world, the belief in universal caus
unity of the universe, are cases in point. I
unreasonable to expect that religion shall b
sion of beliefs not rooted in experience, and
metaphysical. In truth, a belief in the absol
necessary to that part of our life which rest
ment as the belief in cause is to our scientific
with the positivist, that the true principles o
from the observation of man's past develop
moving power in this past development has
No earnest conception of life is possible un
the Holy—the One and Eternal to which we
secondary matter, says Hugenholtz, *how* we co
devotion, but without firm faith in some such
no religion is possible.

Van Hamel, on the other hand, endeavo

possible enthusiastically to pursue a moral ideal without any conviction as to the ultimate fate of this ideal as the world moves on; that is, without any belief in the relation of one's personal religion (moral enthusiasm) to a God who rules the world. He maintains (what is no doubt true) that it is impossible, except from the standpoint of supernaturalism, to establish a real correspondence between the order of the universe and the religious life of the individual. Hence he is content with a religion which is very much a poetical expression of moral experiences. Providence means the independence of circumstances that belongs to the moral man, and so forth. It is not strange that a religious school which finds its highest interest in such vague conceptions, and finds even these open to discussion, is gradually perishing of inanition. Young men in Holland who fall under the influence of the modern school, are in a large proportion of cases alienated from theology altogether, and the school at the moment of its highest triumph seems likely to die for want of disciples.

The other essays in the September number are an examination by Dr J. J. Prins of the new readings introduced by Tischendorf in his Editio VIII., and a paper by Meyboom on the Lucan question. The latter paper deals with the books of Rev. W. Stewart of Glasgow, and Dr G. J. Vos, and reaches only the negative result that no progress has been made in solving the problem of the third gospel.

The "literary survey" in this number is occupied with a sketch by Professor Rauwenhoff, entitled "Works and Communications about J. Duncan, R. Smith Candlish, and Thomas Guthrie." The paper is written with that friendly appreciation which characterises the author, but which would be more valued if it were not so very wide in its range.

# NOTICES OF NEW BO

## Theology and Philosophy

*The Perishing Soul; or, The Scriptural Doctr*
*Sinners, with a View of Ancient Jewish Opi*
*during the First and Second Centuries.* By

In so far as this book merits any notice, it
attempt to parry the force of the fact that the su
for which its author contends, are represented i
to exist. As the subjects of the alleged destruct
in which it is expressed are the strongest kno
survive the infliction of it, there would seem to
ing the interpretation which demands that these
short of absolute extinction of being. If all for
"perish," "be destroyed," &c., without ceasing
seem to be a not unwarrantable assumption,
all that these same terms imply without pass
existence. If a sheep can "be lost" without
Zecharias could "perish" between the templ
"ceasing to be;" if Christ could be "cut off," '
dying vanquish death, does it not of necessity fo
not mean or imply absolute annihilation?

As a specimen of Mr Denniston's method of p
facts, reference may be made to chap. ix. of his
that ἀπόλλυμι, one of the strongest terms expres
Greek language, simply means "to cease to hav
instances of the use of this word, Mr Denniston
to the meaning of *lose* in these cases, there can
mean 'ceasing to possess.'" Having reduced
"ceasing to have," our author proceeds immedia
imply annihilation! This exegetical feat he perf
to the fact, that our Lord teaches (Luke ix. 25)
himself. From this passage we are to infer t
himself has ceased to be.

Now the difficulty here is to imagine how a
the preceding verse, and the light of the parallel
Mark shining in his eyes, could draw such an i
fourth verse our Saviour had just said, "Who
(ψυχή) for my sake, the same shall save it." I
same terms, and in Matthew He says, "Whos
(ψυχή) for my sake, shall *find* it." These pa
question, the very opposite of what Mr Dennist
teach that a thing so identified with a man's
own self, or his own soul, may be lost by him, an

to exist. Surely it is not too much to say, that a thing which may "be saved," or which may "be found," has not been annihilated in the *interim*. As our object in this review is not *destruction*, but *restoration*, we would earnestly entreat both Mr Denniston and those who may have been influenced by such arguments, to return to the old paths, and accept the immemorial doctrine of the Church—the only doctrine deducible from the Bible fairly interpreted—that lost men and lost angels inherit the same dread penalty of everlasting woe.

*The Second Death, and the Restitution of all Things, with some Preliminary Remarks on the Nature and Inspiration of Holy Scripture.* A Letter to a Friend. By ANDREW JUKES.

In a tone of authority common to mystics of a certain order, Mr Jukes discloses in this volume the solution of the great problem of evil. This solution embraces the following points:

"1. God's will by some to bless and save others; by a first-born seed, 'the first-born from the dead,' to save and bless the later-born. 2. His will, therefore, to work out the redemption of the lost by successive ages or dispensations; or, to use the language of St Paul 'according to the purpose of the ages.' 3. His will (thus meeting the nature of our fall) to make death, judgment, and destruction, the means or way to life, acquittal, and salvation; in other words, 'through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and to deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.'"

"These truths," the writer adds, "throw a flood of light on Scripture, and enable us at once to see order and agreement, where without this light there seems perplexing inconsistency" (pp. 27, 28).

Under the head of the first-born are embraced not only Christ Himself, but the Jews and the Christian Church. The Jews become the instruments of the salvation of the nations, and the Church is raised to the rank of priesthood, to minister to those who are yet out of the way. As "Christ barely entered on His priestly work till He had passed through death and judgment, so with those who are Christ's; their death and resurrection shall introduce them to fuller and wider service to lost ones over whom the Lord shall set them as His kings and priests, until all things are restored and reconciled unto Him" (pp. 30–47).

Nor does our author hesitate to go through with his theory. When he says all things are to be reconciled, he means what he says, and means all he says. The devil and his angels are not to be excluded from an amnesty that is absolutely universal. On this latter point he is not so positive; but to the statement that Adam and Lucifer are the two thieves crucified with Christ, and that the latter as well as the former may be taken to paradise, he has nothing (p. 147) to say in reply; and confesses that he cannot see that God would be dishonoured by such a conclusion of the great mystery.

The method of procedure adopted by Mr Jukes is the common one

adopted by Restorationists. In so far as it claims support from Scripture, his theory has nothing to rest on, save forced and unwarranted analogies, and the deductions of an exegesis which refuses to allow of any limitation being set to the widest and wildest comprehension of such universal expressions as, "taketh away the sin of the world;" "by Him to reconcile all things to Himself;" "by Him, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven;" "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

The last-mentioned passage (1 Cor. xv. 22) may serve to illustrate the utter unreliableness of Mr Jukes' exegesis. The "all," taken by him to embrace the whole human race, is limited by the Apostle, in the very next verse, to those who are Christ's. In addition to this, the resurrection spoken of in this chapter is the resurrection of the righteous, and not that of the wicked. As it is in this instance, so is it in every other adduced by our author. Without exception, his interpretation is in utter conflict with the manifest drift of the context, and in palpable antagonism with the analogy of the faith.

As Mr Jukes admits that the restoration for which he contends will not be consummated at the resurrection and judgment described in the Revelation, he is compelled, like other Restorationists, to harmonise his theory with this unquestionably incongruous fact. This he does by falling back on the third element of his own oracular solution, viz., that the way to life is through death, judgment, and destruction. He does not, however, explain how it is that "the second death" can effect what the first death fails to accomplish; nor does he cite any passage to shew that there will be another resurrection and a further judgment for those who, on the conclusion of the first, shall be cast into "the lake of fire;" nor does he point to a single text to prove that the first death and the first judgment introduce any of the sons of men to glory, save those who, prior to their death, were in an estate of salvation. If, at the resurrection, men are judged according to the deeds done in the body, surely it must be manifest that the sentence of the Judge will not, on that momentous day, depend upon any moral change, either for better or worse, which may have taken place between death and the judgment. In fact, this clearly revealed rule of judgment utterly subverts the whole theory of this book. Granted that men, when they rise from the dead, shall be judged according to their lives prior to death (and this the Scriptures expressly teach), does it not of necessity follow that the alleged moral transformations of the intermediate period can have no influence in determining the final award? Mr Jukes' theory, therefore, breaks down on the very threshhold of the process of recuperation. The Scriptures demonstrate that the first alleged experiment shall not produce a single instance of intermediate spiritual purgation, or introduce into the ranks of the saved a single soul not embraced within those ranks prior to death.

As to the restoration of fallen angels, it must suffice to point to the clearly revealed fact, that not only have these lost spirits no interest in the plan of redemption, but in addition to this, that the salvation of God's people involves their destruction. It is by the bruising of the

serpent's head, by the destruction of him that had the power of death, that the brethren of Christ are delivered from sin and death.

*Christian Dogmatics: A Text-book for Academical Instruction and Private Study.* By J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the Dutch by JOHN WATSON WATSON, B.A., Vicar of Newburgh, Lancashire, and MAURICE J. EVANS, B.A., Stratford-upon-Avon. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874. (Theological and Philosophical Library.)

Although in this country there still is a widely prevalent tendency to disparage or condemn the study of systematic theology, and an undue neglect of it even on the part of Christian and evangelical scholars, it is satisfactory to know that in other countries, and notably on the Continent, that important subject is studied and discussed with great zeal and labour by men of all shades of religious opinion. For a true and deep understanding, in its principles, of the system of Christian doctrine is surely most important; and the science which deals with that may fairly claim to be the chief and most central of all the branches of theology. On the Continent, and to some extent also in America, many recent works on Dogmatic, of various schools, Lutheran, Reformed, Rationalistic, Schleiermacherian, and others, shew the reviving interest in this study, so despised and neglected in a former age; and may put to shame the little that has been done for it in this country. It is small credit to the great evangelical bodies in England and Scotland that we should have to import from abroad, not only the stores of biblical and historical learning, but even orthodox Dogmatics.

All the more, however, on this account do we welcome the work before us, as fitted to promote the study and understanding of the subject of which it treats. Dr Van Oosterzee is already known to the English theological public as a careful and sensible expositor and defender of Scripture, by his commentaries in Lange's series, and his work on the Gospel of John, which will conciliate a favourable reception for his present treatise on Dogmatic. This work possesses also intrinsic merits of a high order. The doctrine here set forth is in substance the orthodox evangelical faith common to all the Protestant Churches, avoiding for the most part the more extreme peculiarities both of the Lutheran and of the Calvinistic systems. The author is not one of those who believe in the finality or perfection of any system of theology which has yet been framed. On the contrary, he remarks, in reference to many doctrines, that there seems to be room and need for a more thorough working out and more harmonious combination of the various elements of Scripture teaching. He does not, however, himself make the attempt to give greater completeness and perfection to the results of theological inquiry on such topics; but is content to indicate what progress has been already made, and where, in his opinion, a perfectly satisfactory conclusion has not yet been reached, and further advance remains to be made. There

is thus not much that is fresh in the positive part of the work ; but the commonplaces of Christian faith are expounded and defended in a clear and at the same time thorough and profound manner, with a grasp of their principles, and appreciation of their various bearings, a constant regard to the supreme authority of the Word of God, and a comprehensive knowledge of the discussions on the subject in ancient and modern times. Dr Van Oosterzee is well abreast of the history and literature of his theme ; and a very useful part of his work will be found in the lists of books on the various topics, chiefly modern continental works, which he gives at the end of each section. The paragraphs which follow these literary notices, headed "Points for Inquiry," are also very suggestive, containing indications, often in the form of questions, how the study of the subject in hand may be further pursued, either into more detail, or to the enlargement and completion of the doctrinal results embodied in the text.

The plan and arrangement of the work are very good. The author follows the customary and convenient modern distribution of Dogmatic into Theology proper, Anthropology, Soteriology, Ecclesiology, and Eschatology ; but he avoids the fragmentary and disconnected appearance which this division is apt to have, by skilfully bringing these parts together, under the general idea of the kingdom of God, of which they all exhibit different parts or aspects. In this way, and indeed in his whole treatment of the subject, he gives evidence of having, what is of the very highest importance for the successful treatment of Christian doctrine, a comprehensive grasp of the entire system as an organic whole, of which the various single doctrines form integral and mutually related parts. Moreover, the central and chief thing in his view of the system, is not any mere abstract principle, but the living reality of actual spiritual life. There is a tone of earnest Christian feeling pervading the work, and a generous candour is shewn in estimating and judging various forms of theological opinion. The only great fault in point of arrangement which we observe in this treatise is, that the doctrine of justification does not receive a distinct chapter of its own, but is brought in, as it were, subordinately under the head of Good Works. In consequence of this it obtains only very inadequate treatment. The doctrine of adoption, we may also say, is entirely ignored by Dr Van Oosterzee in this work.

While sympathising heartily with the general substance and spirit of the work, we cannot always agree with the particular views put forth in it. Dr Van Oosterzee, though holding firmly the hereditary transmission of depravity, entirely rejects the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, and that after a very meagre and insufficient discussion of the question, and for what seem to us very unsatisfactory reasons. In fact, it appears to be due in great part to a confusion as to the idea of guilt, which our author seems to identify with culpability, holding that it cannot be separated from personal sin. Now, the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin cannot be defended, nor even correctly stated, without a clear idea of guilt as distinct from culpability, simply in the sense of liability to punishment. The same

confusion appears in his treatment of the doctrine of the atonement, where he hesitates to say that Christ has borne the punishment of our sins, on the ground that the idea of punishment implies personal guilt, or a sense of wrong-doing on the part of the sufferer. Here, however, this verbal deviation from customary statements indicates no real lowering of the strictest view of Christ's death as vicarious. It is even accompanied with the maintenance of what has no positive evidence in Scripture, and is regarded by many evangelical divines as an extreme and incorrect statement, that Christ endured the wrath of God for our sins. These differences are indeed rather verbal than real; yet the setting aside of the idea of guilt, as commonly understood by theologians, prevents one from attaining full or satisfactory views on the imputation either of Adam's sin or of Christ's righteousness; and this may be partly the reason why justification is so inadequately treated in this work.

In regard to what are called the doctrines of grace, Dr Van Oosterzee thinks that the strict Augustinian or Calvinistic views, though containing important elements of truth, do not do justice to all the elements of Scripture teaching, and are not the ultimate results of theological inquiry on the high subjects to which they relate. He does not, however, contribute anything definite to the advance of the science in this direction, but merely sketches out a theory of universal grace, somewhat like that of the Lutheran divines, though acknowledging more fully than they do a free and special predestination to life of all those who are saved. Perhaps, however, he does not differ much in reality from those moderate Calvinists who, like him, scruple to admit an absolute decree of reprobation. It is not quite consistent with our author's usual candour to say that, according to Calvinists, the gospel call, "so far as regards the reprobate, is in no way seriously intended" (p. 452); or to quote Calvin's *decretum horribile* as a confession of the shocking nature of his own doctrine. There is also a curious slip in the same place, when it is alleged that the *Formula Consensus Helvetici* asserted Supralapsarianism, the fact being indubitable that it did exactly the reverse. Another historical inaccuracy we have observed in the discussion of the person of Christ, where it is said that the proposition, "One of the Persons of the Trinity was crucified," which was admitted as orthodox by the Fifth Œcumenical Council, "obtained for the Monophysite tendency of thought a temporary ascendancy" (p. 521); the fact being, that that proposition has been uniformly accepted as true both by Catholic and Reformed divines; and so far from having a Monophysite tendency, was suspected by some to be capable even of a Nestorian sense. Perhaps a more distinct recognition of the truth meant to be defended by that proposition would have kept Dr Van Oosterzee from stating that "the sinlessness of the Lord is to be regarded as an attribute of His true humanity, and thus to be clearly distinguished from the absolute holiness of Him who cannot even be tempted of evil. The moral purity of the Lord did not, in itself, exclude even the least possibility of sinning" (p. 500). Thus to assert of the humanity of Christ, or of Christ as man, anything which we refuse to assert of God, or of the Logos, is virtually to divide the person of our Saviour.

These, however, are but few and comparatively slight errors in a large work, which is distinguished, on the whole, by the correctness of its statements and the Scripturalness of its doctrines, and which is a great boon and help to students of theology. It has been translated into clear and readable English, which seems to do justice to the original.

*Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine.* The Fifth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By ROBERT RAINY, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1874.

It is difficult, but happily of no great moment, to decide whether the Cunningham Lectureship owes most to Dr Rainy, or Dr Rainy to the Cunningham Lectureship. On the one hand, this volume does credit to the Lectureship, and justifies the wisdom of its founder, by its intrinsic value and by its suitableness to the times. On the other hand, it is a volume which would never have been produced save under pressure of some such provocation as this foundation affords. It is always a doubtful and delicate matter to stimulate men's faculty for publication. The rough law of supply and demand probably protects us from a good deal of heavy and insipid theology, and anything like hot-house forcing should be administered with the utmost care. It is satisfactory, therefore, to come upon an instance—not that this is by any means unprecedented—in which this method has produced a thoroughly serviceable book.

But this is a volume of which it is much easier to see the origin than to predict the fate. Dr Rainy's is not a common mind; and he has been at no pains to make it common, has ground down none of his idiosyncracies of thought to fit more softly into other men's expectations. If not the most original, he is certainly the most independent of thinkers. He not only thinks by himself and for himself, but he utters his thought precisely as it arises in his own mind, and with no reference to the mind he addresses. He satisfies himself, and is careless to explain himself to others. Some writers look too much to effect; Dr Rainy looks too little. And a reader begins to resent that he has not been considered; that more time has not been spent by the author on arrangement, illustration, and all modes of making his mind quickly intelligible. He has not even the help afforded by a good table of contents; the table prefixed to this volume being as intricate as the book itself, and one might almost say, slovenly. Indeed, throughout our perusal of these Lectures, those words have been in our mind in which Augustus described to Tiberius the first of his probable competitors for the empire, "Capacem sed aspernantem," —Equal to empire, but would disdain it. A most capable man is here, but mixed with this capacity is the slightest dash of contempt; no, not positive contempt, but indifference to what other men will make of his thought. The ability is always there. You feel throughout that you are in the company of a very powerful man. It is the same ponderous steam-hammer that is working, even though at present it be only delicately driving tacks. There is an imperturbable calmness, an equa-

bility and almost dreamy ease, which certainly convey the impression of an immense reserve of force, but which also convey the not quite so grateful impression, that neither the subject nor the audience have been felt weighty enough to call forth the whole available power. "Capacem sed aspernantem;" this motto claims him as its fittest impersonation.

"The views which I am to present . . . are presented as views which might approve themselves to those who share my own position with reference to the material questions of theology. They appear to me to be coherent and credible, viewed from that position, and to supply a reasonable solution for questions which men in that position have to answer. If, in addition, they are able to commend themselves to any of those who occupy other positions, so much the better."

Picture the state of mind of the young freethinker who came to hear his favourite difficulties minutely sifted and respectfully reasoned away, and who is left with this as the last word Dr Rainy has directly for him. But does Dr Rainy think it is fair to leave to his critics the whole task of conciliating the public?

This solitariness of the lecturer's thinking has its good and its bad side. No man looks straighter at things and is less embarrassed by words and the meanings put upon them by past generations. He never falls under the power of terminology. He may boast with Dante that no word ever made him say what he did not wish. We feel always that the words we read are not echoes or ghosts, but fresh, living productions of a presently energetic mind. Bishop Hampden very truly says that "reasonings may be well framed, and conclusions accurately drawn, and systems of theology erected by the mere use of the terms of theology as signs, just as in arithmetic calculations are carried on without referring at each step to the particular things represented, and by simply attending, during the process, to the relative value of the numbers." No one need fear that he will meet with this bane of theology in any writing of Dr Rainy's. There are no merely technical or traditionary phrases. He does not even make much use of his own memory; all is the production of a mind now and here producing. The principle which he asserts of the Church and her Creed he spontaneously applies to his own utterances: "The Church has no right to speak, except out of present and actual conviction." Even where he is going over ground that all previous theologians have trodden, he makes a path for himself. In re-stating what has often before been stated, as in the chapters on the *Delivery of Doctrine*, he takes you deeper into the heart and essence of the matter. Surely no other man could have written a book on Doctrine and made no allusion to Hampden's celebrated *Lectures*, and still more celebrated *Introduction*, nor uttered one word in admiration of Newman's magnificent defence of scientific theology. But this originality or solitariness of thinking results in a style of language which is so foreign to that in which ordinary minds move, that to many readers it requires translation. And this extends, of course, to his sentences and paragraphs. He seldom gives you the form of sentence you expect; and that which he does give

is frequently unrhythmical. Reading a page is like walking on a rocky beach or down a rough hill-side: no two steps are alike; each has its own measure and mode. His style, moreover, is weighted and obscured with a multitude of subsidiary ideas, which help to body forth his own mind in completeness, but only obstruct and worry the reader who is eagerly prosecuting the main theme. Lowell says of Emerson's disjointed writing, that "it was as if, after vainly trying to get his paragraphs into sequence and order, he had at last tried the desperate expedient of *shuffling* them." The style of the present volume is very different from Emerson's, but in certain parts it might be relieved from considerable obscurity by a more careful arrangement of paragraphs, or by a little condescension to the dulness of the reader, in the way of more obviously marking the sequence and relevancy of the thoughts introduced. In fine, it seems doubtful whether Dr Rainy has sufficiently humbled himself before the hard truth that, "if a man have anything to tell, the world cannot be expected to listen to him unless he has perfected himself in the best way of telling it."

But the mischief is, he is listened to as no other man in Scotland is; and this problem it is which has tempted us aside from reviewing the book to criticising the mind which the book exhibits. How is it, that with all his tortuosities and irrelevancies, his preference of suggestion to plain statement, and of twilight to sunlight, his dislike to simple and direct utterances, his speaking should yet give the pleasure and mental satisfaction which commonly result from direct, lucid, and sparkling address? To interrupt the enthusiastic exclamations of Dr Rainy's admirers, as they pour out excitedly from hearing him, and to pull them up with the question, What did he say? What do you know now that you did not know before? would be cruel; but it would also be foolish; for, according to the great principle of which he makes so much use in the volume before us, there may be virtual knowledge, and rich and various impressions, and an attained position, while there is comparatively little of explicit and exact doctrine. The mind may have received a great deal, which it cannot yet consciously appropriate and know for its own: the truth it caught a glimpse of is none the less true and real because it has again, for a little, passed out of sight. As Newman shews, with unconscious self-satire, it is these latent truths which shape the life; so that "when persons would trace the history of their own opinions in past years, how baffled they are in the attempt to fix the date of this or that conviction, their system of thought having been all the while in continual, gradual, tranquil expansion." People believe that Dr Rainy is a good speaker, not because he conveys any very explicit meaning, but because he puts their minds in a better attitude towards truth; not because he puts his hearers in possession of material for giving a reason of the hope that is in them, but because the contagion of his own reasonable hopefulness inspirits them; not because his conclusions are definite or his doctrine well-proved—for he prefers to state principles, and leave to his hearers the responsibility of the deductions—but because his words communicate convictions which are seen to be those of a wise, independent, fearless, and absolutely sincere

man ; in short, because from him they receive "that inspiring lift which only genius can give, and without which all doctrine is chaff." But this kind of impression is much more readily made by the living speaker than by a book. It is only in a muffled and indirect way that the personal influence here reaches us, and to compensate for this there must be a patient assimilation of the substance of the volume, an application of Cicero's "pernoctat nobiscum, peregrinatur, rusticatur," which, we greatly fear, only a few will undertake.

The book has a twofold value. Principal Rainy is the likeliest leader of the Free Church of Scotland, and, some would say, the likest thing to a great man that Scotland is at present blessed with ; and it is desirable to know what this man is thinking about certain questions which involve the future policy of the Church and the theological prospects of the rising generation. But, apart from this, have these Lectures an intrinsic value ? As an anonymous production, what purpose would they serve ? Has the book a *raison d'être ?* Does it relieve us from the necessity of reading some half-dozen other books ? Does it put us in possession of anything we had not previously held, but which must henceforth keep a place among our thoughts ? Most decidedly it does. It not only abounds in sayings which exhibit a remarkable insight into the principles regulating Divine revelation, and thrills the reader with the satisfactory feeling that here, at last, he has penetrated to the solid rock ; it is not only rich in passages so wise and pregnant as to make it worthy of the same shelf with Newman and Archer Butler, but it is also a decided advance in the treatment of a great subject. Butler's *Letters*, of course, shew very evident marks of the haste with which they were composed. They are satisfactory as an exposure of some of Newman's fallacies, and form, on the whole, an adequate reply to his averments ; but they cannot be said to put us in possession of a sound and final theory of development. His good sense and wide knowledge do indeed guide him here and there to statements which, if deliberately considered and adequately followed out, would inevitably have led him to truer views of the early Church, and to the same position regarding development which Dr Rainy has the honour of first distinctly enouncing and adequately defending. Dr Rainy does not much concern himself with criticising others—though his account of Butler's position is fair, so far as it goes—and has therefore more scope to build up, as he does, an accurate and satisfactory, if not quite complete, account of the development of doctrine. The difference between Butler and him is very much the difference which his own volume succeeds in accounting for, and which exists between the doctrinal knowledge of the early and that of the later Church—of an undeveloped and a developed condition. What you have in Butler in a confused, undefined, inconsistent, latent form, you have in Rainy in all the maturity of ascertained, logically developed, consciously attained, and verified knowledge. This advance is specially seen in the settlement of the starting-point of the Church's mental acquirements. When the writer definitely states that the Church started in its career of doctrinal attainment, not from the revelation given in Scripture, but from the understanding which the early Church

had of the contents of that revelation, many persons may suppose that they have always recognised this. And so they may, perhaps, but for the most part in a dim, disconnected way. The merit of this volume is, that it definitely affirms this fact, and brings it to bear with the most salutary effect on the theory of development, shewing that all valid development is an advance, not *beyond* Scripture, but into its fulness of meaning. The lucid statement of this important fact, the sensible and easy justification of the doctrine-making function of the Church, and the skill with which the principles regulating the delivery of doctrine in the Old and New Testaments are made to play into the subsequent development of doctrine,—these, in our opinion, constitute the claim of this volume to have made a *material* contribution to theology. It is a rich and nutritious book throughout, and in temper and spirit beyond all praise; but, while many points may be handled somewhat better than elsewhere, these now mentioned are nowhere else, so far as we know, at all so well treated, if treated at all. Doctrine is a wide field, and many questions for an answer to which one might look in this volume are not mentioned; but this is unavoidable. We should have liked to see the laws of legitimate development more clearly laid down, and to see the good and evil of scientific theology more carefully sifted. We should like to hear Dr Rainy's account of the natural advantages and of the training of the apostles, which fitted them to be the means of completing Revelation, and also to have his answer to the question,—Can the Church make no theological advance of any kind beyond Scripture? It would serve a great practical end, too, were the country agreed as to the best mode of teaching doctrine to the laity (*i.e.*, in point of fact, to children, for adults learn little), and whether it should be done as the Shorter Catechism proposes, or as the world in its childhood was taught; but on many such questions Dr Rainy is necessarily silent.

The last lecture, being devoted to the subject of Creeds, will by many be read with greatest eagerness. The three points commonly treated are here discussed; the warrantableness of creeds as tests of admission to office, the legitimate length or particularity of creeds, and the expediency of revision. Using the common arguments for their use as tests of admission, he does so in a wise and liberal spirit, and frankly admits real difficulties, while exploding those that are fictitious. The most serious objection, that they tend to bias opinion, he answers very characteristically: "Men were intended to deal with temptations, to feel the force of them, and to overcome them." He, of course, pronounces against the use of the same creed for elders and deacons as for ministers.

The reasons for introducing subordinate points into creeds are summed up thus:

"It is felt that a fuller declaration will more clearly ascertain what is meant; will guard against the annoyance of mere crotchet and inconsistency; will avert some of the troubles connected with incipient and half-conscious heresy."

But it seems to us that the most important utterance in this lecture is the following:

"I have never been able to see that any church is at liberty to proceed in this matter on any principles but those which apply to the universal Church, or to accept any rule or mode of action which might not be adopted by the universal Church were it placed in the same circumstances."

Here he touches the root of the whole business. But why did he not go on to attempt to shew what the very nature of the Universal Church requires as fundamentals? Failure here would have been better than the wisest remarks which leave this untouched. Why did he not shew us what right we have to hold a creed which does exclude churches which yet we dare not unchurch, but do practically admit to hold the essentials of Christianity? The principle stated above lies at the foundation of all right thinking and right action about creeds, but it is difficult to shew its consistency with the assertion, that articles which are not fundamental should be allowed in any church's creed.

As to Revision, following his own clear-seeing mind, he says so much in favour of it, that at length he seems to fear he may be interpreted as advocating some movement in that direction, and therefore pulls up and throws in so many words of slow wisdom, that the result is an absolute neutrality. What he says very much amounts to this: Revision is a good thing, a duty, but don't do it. He advocates rather provision for revising than revision itself. "Regular provision for considering changes that might be proposed, would not, in all likelihood, lead to frequent changes." This is but an ecclesiastical application of Burke's great maxim, that the State which has not the means of change has not the means of conservation, and well illustrates the position of the genuine Conservative-Liberal, if not Liberal-Conservative.

*Darwinism and Design; or, Creation by Evolution.* By GEORGE ST CLAIR, F.G.S., &c. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1873.

In this work we have a concise and interesting statement of the hypothesis of evolution as it is put forward by its leading advocates in this country. For, though the title emphasises Darwinism in particular, the author discusses the application of the principle to the inorganic as well as to the organic world, and likewise makes considerable modifications on Darwin's view, altering and augmenting it with improvements that have occurred to his own mind, or have been suggested by Spencer and other evolutionists. In this way, he is able to parry some of the most damaging objections that have been urged against the theory in itself, and in particular to denude it of that dysteleological character which had attached to it, not from its own essential nature, but from certain importunate and defective methods of conception and statement adopted by its chief expounder, and elaborated by followers, who have by these been deluded into the supposition that Evolution was inherently irreconcilable with Design. Were not the task too large and detailed for our limited space, we should have liked to exhibit at length the several points where our author diverges from Mr Darwin, and then to have

given a brief sketch of the ingenious manner in which he re-establishes Teleology on the foundation of this modified Darwinism. For the reconciliation he effects is between a considerably modified Darwinism and a re-constituted Teleology. While, with Mr Darwin, he holds that the various species of animals have been produced by the preservation of natal variations, he rejects the representation of fortuitousness given to the process, and ascribes both the origination and establishment of those variations which have resulted in new species to the influence of the successive stages in the necessary procession of the physical surroundings of animal life. In a word, he will not believe that the present position of the animal world is the outcome of random chance, depending on the appearance of slight varieties, which might or might not have happened ; but maintains that it has been produced by a regular and inevitable modification of animal existence, conditioned by the alteration of inanimate existence, and therefore characterised by the same necessity. Having thus divested Darwin's exposition of its irreconcileable element, Mr St Clair has little difficulty in adjusting the argument from design to their conception of creation by evolution. In place of the representation of a Designer producing each limb severally, and without instrumentation, he substitutes that of a Creator, who works through machinery, advancing on previous results ; and thus he finds progressive design all along the chain. In addition to this central position, our author shews at length how this representation of creation furnishes new aspects of the Divine wisdom and benevolence, while it suggests explanations of some of the most perplexing problems of existence. There is much in the book that is well worthy of perusal, and we only regret that it should have been set forth in the form chosen. So long as the Darwinian theory remains a partial and unproved hypothesis, existing in many varied forms, and constantly subjected to material modifications and limitations, it is both needless and vain to elaborately adjust its relations to religion. Should it ultimately attain the position of a stable and satisfactory explanation of the method of creation, it will then be time to see how our statements of the religious aspects of that great fact may require alteration or improvement. Any such attempt at present can only have a transitory value and interest. We like exceedingly the spirit in which Mr St Clair approaches both science and religion. His talents and attainments are evidently substantial, and we shall look for more important contributions from him in these departments.

*History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age.* By EDWARD REUSS. Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD ; with a Preface and Notes by R. W. DALE, M.A. Vol. II. London : Hodder & Stoughton, Paternoster Row. 1874.

The second volume of this History of Apostolic Theology will be found not less interesting than its predecessor. If we mistake not, it will be more highly appreciated by the majority of English readers, as

it moves more exclusively in the circle of New Testament thought. It embraces an account of the theology of St Paul, of St Peter, of St James, and of St John. There is also a sketch of the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Epistles of Barnabas and Clement are touched upon, and chapters are devoted to the theological ideas which were to be found in the historical books of the New Testament. The author is a fresh and penetrating thinker, and the student cannot fail to derive great benefit from his thoughtful pages. Even where assent must be withheld from his conclusions, M. Reuss helps one to understand a question. Such books are much wanted among us,—books which will gather together and place in connection the results which have been obtained by exegetical scholarship in modern times. Mr Dale, in his capacity of editor, has added a number of notes. These are interesting, and sometimes valuable, but we confess to a certain misgiving as to the literary morality of such a mode of editing the work of a living author. The editor is opposed to the views of M. Reuss on points important and unimportant; and whenever these points of difference emerge, Mr Dale appends brief notes, in which he says in substance that M. Reuss is wrong, and if he had time and space he could easily prove him to be so. Such unsupported protests are not likely to counteract the errors of M. Reuss; and it appears to us a grave error of taste to edit the book of a distinguished foreign theologian in a manner so little respectful.

## New Testament Exegesis.

*The Life of Christ.* By Frederic W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 2 vols. Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. London, Paris, and New York.

We are informed in the preface to these volumes that the publishers, whose names are honourably connected with the dissemination of cheap and wholesome literature among the people, had long desired to place in the hands of general readers such a sketch of the life of Christ on earth as should enable them to realise it more clearly, and to enter more thoroughly into the details and sequence of the Gospel narratives. The difficult and delicate task was in the first instance entrusted to an "eminent theologian" (probably Dr Ellicott), whose elevation to the episcopate prevented him from fulfilling it.

"Under these circumstances," writes Dr Farrar, "application was made to me, and I could not but at first shrink from a labour for which I felt that the amplest leisure of a lifetime would be insufficient, and powers incomparably greater than my own would still be utterly inadequate. But the considerations that were urged upon me came no doubt with additional force from the deep interest with which, from the first, I contemplated the design. I consented to make the effort, knowing that I could at least promise to do my best, and believing that he who does the best he can, and always seeks the blessing of God upon his labours, cannot finally and wholly fail."

The remarkable acceptance which Dr Farrar's book has met with during

the few months it has been before the public, is an evidence that the task which he undertook with fear and trembling has been well performed. A perfect life of Christ is indeed not conceivable. Every book on this greatest of all subjects, the reader must close with some sense of its inadequacy. However well the subject has been treated, there always must remain the feeling that there is more of glory and divine wisdom in the gospel narratives than the most discerning of writers can bring forth. This belongs to the subject; but Dr Farrar has succeeded as few in our judgment have succeeded before him. He is a little too rhetorical and ornate in his style, which may be attributed to his desire to make his subject attractive, especially to his younger or less educated readers; but after every abatement has been made, his book remains one for which the Christian public have reason to thank him most cordially. Good use has been made of the large materials which our growing familiarity with Eastern customs and Eastern literature has made available. While thus endeavouring to set his pictures in fitting setting, Dr Farrar has not, like some writers, contented himself with giving a book made up of mere externals. He has boldly touched the religious and theological problems which form the kernel of the matter, and for the sake of which alone the externals are valuable. Christ is set forth with all plainness as the Son of Man and also as the Son of God. To him He is no Jewish Rabbi, gifted with exquisite religious sensibilities. He is represented in accordance with the creed of the Church as the Son of God and the Redeemer of mankind. Dr Farrar's concluding sentences regarding the ascension will give an idea of his style as well as of his theological position:

"Between us and His visible presence—between us and that glorified Redeemer who now sitteth at the right hand—that cloud still rolls. But the eye of faith can pierce it; the incense of true prayer can rise above it; through it the dew of blessing can descend. And if He is gone away, yet He has given us in His holy Spirit a nearer sense of His presence, a closer infolding in the arms of His tenderness, than we could have enjoyed even if we had lived with Him of old in the home of Nazareth, or sailed with Him in the little boat over the crystal waters of Gennesareth. We may be as near to Him at all times—and more than all when we kneel down to pray—as the beloved disciple was when he laid his head upon His breast. The word of God is very nigh us, even in our mouths and in our hearts. To ears that have been closed, His voice may seem indeed to sound no longer. The loud voices of War may shake the world; the eager calls of Avarice and of Pleasure may drown the gentle utterance which bids us "follow Me;" after two thousand years of Christianity the incredulous murmurs of an impatient Scepticism may make it scarcely possible for Faith to repeat without insults the creed which has been the regeneration of the world. But the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will shew them His covenant. To all who will listen, He still speaketh. He promised to be with us always, even to the end of the world, and we have not found His promise fail."

In conclusion, we would again say that Dr Farrar's volume is a most valuable addition to popular theology, and deserves to be read and studied especially by those who have not time for more learned works

but who are interested in the many questions connected with the life of Jesus, which have been brought into prominence by the present spirit of inquiry and of scepticism."

## Church History.

*Churches: the Many and the One.* A New and Revised Edition of *The Constitution of the Christian Church.* By William Albin Garratt, Esq. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday.

This book was originally published more than a quarter of a century ago. The author, a barrister, a member of the Church of England, had been led to make a thorough examination of the questions at issue between evangelical Churchmen and the authors of the then famous "Tracts for the Times." The doctrine of the Apostolic Succession of the Episcopate is subjected to a sifting investigation, in the light both of Scripture and of history; and, to quote the words of the editor, a clergyman of the Church of England, it is shewn that, in the first place, there is not only no evidence of any transmission of Apostolical authority to successors, but that there is clear evidence that in many churches in apostolic days, and in some in post apostolic days, there were no Bishops as distinct from the Presbyters; and that to a later period still, in at least one very important church, that of Alexandria, where there was a Bishop presiding over presbyteries, he was chosen and ordained by Presbyters, and not by Bishops. The spirit of the book may be fairly represented by an extract from the editor's preface:

"According to what is proved in this book, we are clearly bound to regard other Churches not episcopal, in the same light in which the Church of Ephesus or of Smyrna regarded the Church of Corinth or the Church of Philippi. We have no right even to say, with Hooker, that Episcopacy is essential to the wellbeing of a church, much less that it is essential to its being; and we are absolutely bound to recognise as properly ordained all in each particular church in which the Word of God is faithfully preached and the sacraments rightly administered, who are ordained by those who in that particular church have authority."

Though Apostolical Succession is the leading topic of the book, the whole subject of the constitution of the Church of Christ is brought under review. There are chapters on "Miraculous Powers," "The Seven," "Different Classes of Ministers," "Appointment of Ministers and their Ordination," "Schism," "The Visible Universal Church," "Discipline of the Church," "Maintenance of Ministers," "National Church." The discussion is conducted throughout with admirable temper and candour, and with much ability. Even where we differ from the author, we respect his honesty and fairness, and admire his excellent spirit. Of course there must be a good many points where the most moderate Episcopalian, and one holding Presbyterian views, must join issue; but if views like those advocated in this book were at all common in the Church of England, we might hope that, with a change

of outward conditions that would leave free scope to spiritual and doctrinal affinities, there might be found a basis for cordial fellowship, perhaps also for united action, on the part of sections of the Church long separated, and in some degree estranged. But we despair of seeing any approach to this state of things till the Christian people assert and take their own place in connection with the administration of Church affairs. It is characteristic of the state of feeling on this question among evangelical men in the Church of England, that it does not appear to come within the author's range of view during the whole course of his inquiries. But, notwithstanding this and other defects, the volume has our cordial recommendation as fitted to be very helpful to those who wish to form intelligent and scriptural opinions on the subjects of which it treats.

## Miscellaneous.

*Science, Theology, Religion; with Notices of the Teaching of Professor Struthers and Others.* By Rev. Alexander Anderson, M.A., Director of Chanonry School (The Gymnasium), Old Aberdeen. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1874.

This excellent little treatise, as it deserves to be called, although in form only a pamphlet, arose out of a controversy which was carried on last winter by Dr Struthers, a lecturer on Anatomy in the University of Aberdeen, and several divines of that city. Dr Struthers, who is highly esteemed as a lecturer on Anatomy, had in his introductory lecture taken occasion not only to commend the theories of Mr Darwin, but to declare that science was at war with theology. With religion, he said he and his fellow *savans* had no quarrel, because religion is a thing not of the head, but of the heart and conduct; but with theology they were at war. The lecture called forth a very sharp controversy in the newspapers, and excited a good deal of public interest. Mr Anderson, the able and highly esteemed Director of the Aberdeen Gymnasium, has, in a pamphlet of eighty pages, reviewed the whole subject of controversy in a manner distinguished for ability and sobriety. Much as he regrets many expressions in Professor Struthers' lecture, he speaks of him in terms of uniform courtesy; and, while he does not profess to be himself a scientific man, he manifests a respect for science, and an appreciation of the benefits which it has conferred upon mankind, highly honourable in the heat of such a controversy.

What Mr Anderson objects to in Professor Struthers and his more distinguished coadjutors, is their attempt to "waste and depopulate" the province of theology. Why, for instance, he asks, should Professor Struthers pronounce the argument for the being of God from design, "sophistry and illusion," because there are a few bones in animals and in man for which he can discover no physiological purpose? And again, with regard to the bearing of evolution on theology, "Even if the gradual development of man from a lower organism were established, it

could not affect the question of the agency of God in making him what he is now. Trace his history backwards to the form of a jelly-fish, if you will, you must fall back ultimately on the power of the great Creator, who not only gave that creature its life, and endowed it with such functions as it had, but formed it with the capacity for surely developing all the noble distinctions of a human frame." Specially valuable are Mr Anderson's remarks on the independent foundations of theology, and on the indissoluble connection between theology and religion, if religion implies a real object of worship, and is not another name for an illusory sentiment. It is not possible, in a short notice, to give an adequate idea of Mr Anderson's able and spirited argument. But the pamphlet is well worth reading as a whole, and the lecture which was the occasion of it seems to have been an illustration of what Professor Tyndall's address in Belfast was another still more remarkable, viz., of the tendency of scientific men at the present day, without provocation and without apparent inducement, to go out of their way to assail theology and theologians. The old claim of theology to be the royal science controlling all others, is but feebly, and in faltering accents, asserted by our theologians ; but it would almost seem as if scientific men had a lurking fear of its possible legitimacy, to judge from the anger and *bravado* with which they are wont to treat it on every opportunity. It is but fair to add, in conclusion, that Professor Struthers is not a materialistic philosopher, but one who believes his scientific creed to be compatible with "the personality, the creating agency, and the moral government of God."

*The Historic Origin of the Bible: A Handbook of Principal Facts from the best recent Authorities, German and English.* By EDWIN CONE BISSELL, A.M. ; with an Introduction by Professor ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York. Edinburgh : Oliphant & Co. 1873.

*Interpretation: Being Rules and Principles assisting to the Reading and Understanding of the Holy Scriptures.* By S. R. BOSANQUET, M.A. London : Hatchards. 1874.

Mr Bissell tells us that in preparing this Handbook of principal facts relating to the historic origin of the Bible, "his object was so to present these as to render them easily accessible and intelligible to ordinary Bible readers, especially to Sunday-school and Bible-class teachers ; and, at the same time, with such conciseness and completeness as to make a treatise not unworthy the notice of ministers, theological students, and others who cultivate the higher learning." It is always extremely difficult for a writer to succeed in the attempt to make a work both popular in style and scientific in substance ; and we do not think that Mr Bissell has found the difficulty of adapting himself equally to the requirements of "Sunday-school teachers" and students of "the higher learning" more easy to overcome than most other authors would have done.

He must surely have had the first class of readers too exclusively in

his eye when he began a treatise on the Historic Origin of the Bible with the "History of the English Bible." This forms Part I., and extends to five chapters, filling eighty pages. We should rather have expected to find this topic taken up last than first, if taken up at all, and could easily have excused its omission altogether, as the author's title-page laid him under no obligation to treat of anything but the *Origines* of Holy Writ. Part II. is occupied with the New Testament, and embraces six chapters, arranged in the following order:—1. The Written Text. 2. Ancient Versions and Printed Text. 3. New Testament Canon. 4. The Gospels and Acts. 5. The Epistles of Paul. 6. Epistle to the Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse. After which, in Part III., the Old Testament is treated of in a similar arrangement of topics, extending to five chapters. We do not think such an arrangement felicitous for the purpose of exhibiting the Historic Origin of the Bible. This is to write a literary history backwards—to put what was last first, and what was first last. With such a programme in his mind, the author should rather have entitled his work, "A Handbook of Bible Introduction."

These, however, are only infelicities of form and order. To the sound and useful quality of the substance of the work we are happy to be able to bear testimony. It is the result of diligent and congenial studies carried on over a wide range of authorship, English and German, and conducted in an excellent spirit and tone, combining the reverence of faith with the freedom of science, and cultivating an equal appreciation, in their just relations, of the divine and human elements of the Book of books. The author quotes a remarkable phrase used by some one, "that he had got a new Bible *through the furnace.*" His own feeling at the close of his labour was, that "through the pleasing agency of most attractive studies the Bible had become to him almost another book—something more human and tangible, without being any the less divine and authoritative, that in seeking to discover where man's original connection with it begins, he had come sensibly nearest to its diviner elements." If the study of his work should have a similar effect upon his readers, such fruit would be the very best which could be desired to result from this and all similar labour upon the text of the Word of Life.

Mr Bosanquet's "Rules and Principles" of Bible Interpretation are very different from those which prevail in most of the Exegesis of the present day. He expresses himself as frankly and freely as possible to this effect in the "Introduction" of his volume:

"Our task is to deal with the method of interpretation which is now current and prevailing in Christendom, and which is endeavouring to impose itself, as a part and branch of European civilisation, upon all nations of the world. This method is growing more and more scholastic and formal and technical; and in consequence less and less fitted to associate itself and sympathise with the spirit and character of the inspired writings. . . . In my *Logic* [alluding to a previous work, entitled *A New System of Logic*], I have endeavoured to shew that no theory of Exegesis in use in Europe, not even Ernesti's, is

such as ought to be accepted as sufficient; and if not in Europe, where can we look for anything that may satisfy the inquirer? I have especially given examples of the nature of the exegesis which is current and approved among us, and of false interpretations arising out of it; complaining that it is philosophical, grammatical, Aristotelian, classical, scholastic, formal, mechanical; and contending that these ingredients have poisoned and vitiated it. I have endeavoured to shew that these methods have cast fetters round it and imprisoned it; have led it captive in narrow paths and labyrinths, and constrained it from the liberty and largeness which properly belong to the greatness and loftiness of the subject and instrument. My endeavour has been to emancipate it from this thraldom; to give freedom and elasticity to its wings to soar and wander in those fields and flights which are the province and scope and characteristic of spiritual things."

With these peculiar and eccentric opinions against all exegesis which is philosophical, grammatical, &c., and in favour of another sort which has the noble qualities of "liberty and largeness," it is curious to see how Mr Bosanquet handles Dr Marsh's "Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible," which he takes to be "the most approved authority" on these subjects. He complains that "in this extensive and elaborate work criticism is placed before interpretation, and that in effect the author scarcely advances a step beyond it." He complains that the author chiefly occupies himself "in throwing fetters of criticism around the work of interpretation, as *e. g.*, that the Scripture itself can be the only warrant for applying a type to an antitype; that interpretation of Scripture must be subject to the same rules which are applicable to other books; and that we cannot be qualified for the interpretation of the Bible till we understand the languages of the Bible." "In all this," Mr Bosanquet strangely adds, "Dr Marsh sets criticism before interpretation, and scarcely rises at all into the region of interpretation." Does Mr B. mean, our readers will ask in astonishment, that neither the criticism of the state of the text, nor any other kind of criticism, is to be gone into before the work of exegesis is ended? or, that in rising into the regions of interpretation, "all criticism is to be left behind and below as belonging to a lower stratum? It would seem incredible that any one who has any scientific knowledge of the subject should intend to convey such a meaning. But Mr B. takes care to make it certain that this is his very meaning. "I contend," says he, "that interpretation naturally and properly comes before criticism, as religion before evidences; that interpretation can be carried far without criticism; and that interpretation oftener and with better effect leads to critical inquiry than criticism leads to useful interpretation; that criticism, in its proper use, is to be called in to correct and confirm interpretation. I have in hundreds of instances seen first what must be the meaning in the vulgar translation, and afterwards found it verified by critical examination; while those who have devoted themselves to philology and the study of the language, have never made one step towards the improvement of a passage, or the interpretation of it. I therefore consider Dr Marsh's *Criticism and Interpretation* to be an unpropitious guide of the general inquirer to a profitable understanding and interpretation of the Scriptures." "I hope"

he adds, "to point out a plainer and readier road to a much larger class of my fellow-searchers into the wisdom and common-sense simplicity of revelation by God's sacred word." Not many of our readers, we suppose, will care, after these specimens of the author's exegetical principles and views, to be informed about the "plainer and readier road" which he undertakes to point out, as they will by this time have conjectured that the author holds a chief place to be due to the figurative, the typical, and the parabolical exegesis. "Typical exegesis may be said in effect to be the whole, the essential spirit of interpretation. I have laboured in my *Logic* to shew, though it was not disputable, that parables and type must of necessity be the vehicle—the almost exclusive vehicle—of revealed knowledge. It must be the sole vehicle of spiritual and heavenly things. The Scriptures begin, continue, and end in type." With such a typical *furor* as this, it is of course impossible for us to have any sympathy. If Marsh's error on the subject of typical interpretation was one of serious defect, Mr B.'s error is one of still more serious, we may well say monstrous, excess. If the Bishop confessedly clipt the wings of exegesis rather too close, we dread more the effects of Mr B.'s boasted emancipation of the science from this thraldom; and we can have no wish, either for ourselves or others, to learn from him how "to soar and wander" in "those fields and flights" to which he invites us. We prefer keeping on *terra firma* to all such "soaring"; and "wandering" is of course quite out of the question when what we want to do is to keep in the right road.

# BOOKS RECEIVED.

We congratulate Messrs Clark on the completion of their edition of Lange's Commentaries on the New Testament, by the issue of the tenth volume, containing the *Commentary on the Revelation of St John.* In this commentary, Lange hopes that he has put an end to the "great lost labour of a chronological computation of the numbers, that chronic malady of Apocalyptic exegesis." We trust so. In addition to the usual thorough examination of the text, exegetical remarks, and *excursus* on various topics, this volume contains indices most useful for the consultation of the whole series of commentaries. In *The Epistle to the Hebrews; a Justification of its National Title and Character*, by John Leech, M.A., being the Donnellan Lectures (Dublin: Hodges, Foster, & Co.), the author strives to shew that by keeping in view the persons for whom it was written, many difficult passages, as ch. vi. 4–8, xiii. 10–17, &c., can be better explained. His principle is a sound one, and we have been much interested in its working out.

*The Philosophy of the Cross*, by the Rev. R. M. Edgar, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton), is a series of twenty-two able, earnest, and, we are sure, popular sermons on the relation of the cross to salvation and life. There is an inflation about the style sometimes which one could wish absent. It distracts attention from the real excellencies of the book. *Sermons on the Life and Character of the Day*, by the Rev. Robert Paisley, minister of St Ninian's (Blackwood & Sons), form a memorial volume which will doubtless be prized by those who have heard the venerable author preach during his long ministry.

The contest between religion and science, or rather the attack made on the former by those who falsely think that it can be at bottom antagonistic to the latter, is fruitful of books. *Science, Creeds, and Scripture, what they teach of the Mystery of God*, by Daniel Reid (W. Blackwood & Sons), is thoughtful and recondite, but wanting in clearness of aim and of expression. *Divine Revelation or Pseudo-Science?* by R. G. Suckling Browne, B.D. (Longman & Co.), is another protest against the unscientific assumptions of men of science; and *Popular Objections to Revealed Truth* (Hodder & Stoughton) is a series of lectures by able men in London on various controverted points. This is a book to be recommended.

We have received the second volume of Professor Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy* (T. & T. Clark), translated by George S. Morris, M.A. This completes the work to which we have already called attention.







